



**November Revolution
Stalin Centenary Special**

*Proletarian
Era*

Contents

- Editorial 3
- On Marxist concept of authority
and denigration of Stalin by the
revisionists 9
- Stalin's brilliant fight against
both Left and Right deviations 25

After the experience of Social-Democrats in power, when they broke strikes, organised lockouts and shot down workers, the false promises of "industrial democracy", "peace in industry" and "peaceful methods" of struggle sound like cruel mockery to the workers.

.....Needless to say, the crisis will strike a crushing blow at all these and similar illusions".

—J. V. Stalin

EDITORIAL

Long Live November Revolution Red Salute Comrade Stalin

The anniversary of the Great November Socialist Revolution returns every year to awaken the toiling masses all over the world to the historic significance of this turning point in the progress of society. This year, 1979, unites the November Revolution anniversary with the birth centenary of Comrade Stalin. The occasion thus assumes a greater importance for realizing the significance of the revolution and grasping its teachings.

Because, Stalin it was who defended and consolidated the revolution after the death of Lenin, the architect of the November Revolution. It was Stalin who safeguarded the revolutionary spirit of Marxism-Leninism by waging a relentless struggle against the Trotskyites and the social democrats. Stalin, by generalising upon the historical experience of the period of general crisis of capitalism and further disintegration of the world capitalist market, and by conducting a ceaseless struggle in different spheres of life, elaborated and enriched Marxism-Leninism. Under Stalin's revolutionary leadership in the international communist movement there had been unprecedented growth, development and success of communist movement in the colonies, semi-colonies and metropolitan countries, although there were serious defects and shortcomings. As Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, an outstanding Marxist thinker and leader of this era, pointed out : "Stalin's understanding of Leninism is the understanding of all communists of Marxism-Leninism. This understanding has brought the communist movement to its present stature.Indeed, like his precursors, Marx, Engels and Lenin, Stalin is also an authority on Marxism-Leninism..... Not only as a theoretician of outstanding calibre but also as an able practical organiser of the communist movement, Stalin should be remembered with Marx, Engels and Lenin".

We recall, with full respect and honour, the great contributions of Comrade Stalin and pay our homage to him on this occasion of his birth centenary.

The November Revolution ushered in a new era in human history, abolishing the rule of capital, exploitation of man by man. The proletariat of Russia, under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party led by Lenin, had seized the state power of that country through this revolution and founded the world's first socialist state. All the preceding revolutions in history saw transfer of state power from one class to another class, but not the end to class exploitation. The November Revolution paved the way, for the first time, for ending class exploitation. For most people before this revolution, it was inconceivable that the illiterate, ignorant workers and peasants could lay hold of the state power, retain it and run it. The November Revolution demonstrated: They can when they acquire political maturity.

Central to the historic significance of the November Revolution is a fundamental teaching of Lenin on revolution, which he emphasized while fighting against social democrats of diverse shades in the period of preparation for the revolution. After the February Revolution of 1917, which had brought the bourgeoisie to the state power by overthrowing the Tsardom, the social democrats in the then revolutionary movement of Russia had given the call for supporting the bourgeois Provisional Government of Kerensky on the plea that the anti-feudal, anti-imperialist tasks of this bourgeois democratic revolution had remained unfulfilled. They argued that until and unless the unfulfilled economic and social tasks of the BDR were completed, the stage would not be set for the socialist revolution, and it would be futile to prepare for a revolution to overthrow the bourgeoisie from the state power. Lenin showed that to understand the relation between the economic base and the political superstructure in this way was to reduce Marxism to economic determinism. It amounted to a mockery of Marxism. Pointing to the uneven development of capitalism, the twists and

turns, the zigzags, the ups and downs of revolutionary movement, he showed that amid such tussles politics and political events are influencing economic situation tremendously—becoming actually the determinant. So, Lenin emphasized: "Politics always supersedes economy". And on this basis he pointed out; "The fundamental question of every revolution is the question of state power". (Lenin—A Dual Power) That is to say, in determining the strategy of revolution, the main question is the question of the class character of the state. Stalin elaborated it in his inimitable words: "In the hands of which class, or which classes, is power concentrated, which class, or which classes, must be overthrown, which class, or which classes, must take power—such is the main question of every revolution". (The Party's Three Fundamental Slogans on the Peasant Problem)

On the question of the strategy of revolution, Lenin also refuted the revisionist slogan of joint leadership of the bourgeoisie and the working class over the bourgeois democratic revolutions of this era. He showed that in the present era of imperialism and proletarian revolution the bourgeois democratic revolution of different countries were part and parcel of the world socialist or proletarian revolution. Without the working class leadership, the bourgeois democratic revolutions of this era, even in colonies and dependent countries, could not reach their logical culmination. Because, in the present era of moribund capitalism when world capitalism had entered the stage of imperialism and had turned out-and-out reactionary, the bourgeoisie as a class had lost its erstwhile revolutionary character of the era of rising capitalism.

For all this, Lenin opposed the call of the social democrats to support the bourgeois provisional government of Kerensky and to demand of it any reformist steps that would breed illusion among the masses about bourgeois parliament. To define clearly the task of the Russian proletariat,

following the February Revolution, he explained: "Before the February-March Revolution of 1917, state power in Russia was in the hands of one old class, namely the feudal landed nobility, headed by Nicholas Romanov.

Now, after that revolution, the power is in the hands of another class, a new class, namely the bourgeoisie.

The transfer of state power from one class to another class is the first, the principal, the basic sign of a revolution, both in the strictly scientific and in the practical political meaning of the term.

To this extent, the bourgeois, or the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia has been completed". And Russia had entered the stage of socialist revolution "which must place the power in the hands of the proletariat and the poorest strata of the peasantry." (The April Theses)

If we now analyse the class character of the Indian state in the light of the above teaching of Lenin, what conclusion do we arrive at? Which class is in the state power following the Independence? Unless blind with obsession, can one doubt that it is the Indian bourgeoisie, or the national reformist section of the Indian bourgeoisie which led the Independence struggle of this country?

The proletariat of India recalls with great respect what Comrade Stalin had analysed regarding the Indian situation before the independence as far back as 1925: "The fundamental and new feature of the conditions of life of colonies like India is not only that the national bourgeois has split into a revolutionary party and a compromising party, but primarily that the compromising section of the bourgeoisie has already managed, in the main, to strike a deal with imperialism. Fearing revolution more than it fears imperialism, and concerned more about its money bags than about the interests of its own country, this section of the bourgeoisie, the richest

and most influential section, is going over entirely to the camp of the irreconcilable enemies of the revolution. It is forming a bloc with imperialism against the workers and peasants of its own country". (Tasks of the University of the Peoples of the East) According to Stalin's analysis, therefore, the compromising section of the national bourgeoisie, that is to say the national reformist section of the national bourgeoisie, that is to say the national reformist section of the Indian bourgeoisie, had managed to dominate the independence struggle in the twenties through compromise with the imperialists. It is common knowledge that this class had usurped the leadership of the independence struggle all along taking advantage of the absence of a genuine Marxist-Leninist Party in our country in that period. Can there be any doubt, therefore, as to which class it is that came to power in 1947 following the transfer of power?

Analysing the class character of the present Indian state, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, our beloved leader, teacher and guide, and an outstanding Marxist thinker of this era, showed conclusively that the Indian national bourgeoisie is the class which is firmly established in the state power and the state is being led by it. The main political programme here is, therefore, seizure of power by the proletariat overthrowing the ruling bourgeoisie from state power. That is to say, the Indian revolution is anti-capitalist socialist revolution. Parties like the CPI(M), CPI, etc. who advocate the people's democratic or the national democratic revolution for our country are victim of economic determinism in the same way as the social democrats of Russia against whom Lenin had to wage a ceaseless struggle. But these parties, in describing the stage of the Indian revolution as people's democratic or national democratic, are not only chewing the cud of economic determinism, but are distorting as well the actual stage of eco-

conomic development in India. It is important to remember in this connection that Stalin, while discussing the features of colonies and dependent countries as far back as 1925, grouped these countries into three categories. He included India in the third category, describing it as capitalistically the most developed of all these countries. Long years have elapsed since then. And Comrade Shibdas Ghosh showed how the Indian capital, through "the birth of national capital, the development of indigenous industries, the transformation of national capital into monopoly capital, the birth of financial oligarchy through the merger of industrial capital and banking capital, the exercise of control by the Indian monopolists over the industrial and even the agricultural produce and over the whole economic life of the country through stock exchange and banks, as also the birth of Indian finance capital and its export not only to the markets of Asia and Africa and different European countries but to the USA and UK even", had attained not only the monopoly character but the imperialist character as well. (Why SUCI is the Only Genuine Communist Party in India) Is not the Indian monopoly capitalist class a partner of the international trust and cartel which is an international economic organisation of the imperialists? May be a junior partner, but still a partner and a competitor too.

In 1917, after the bourgeoisie had come to power through the February Revolution, Russia was economically a far backward country, dominated in the economic sphere by the rich Western European capitalist countries. Feudalism was the dominant force in the rural economy of Russia though capitalism was making inroad. But judging against the fundamental question of revolution, from the point of view of state power, as Lenin had pointed out, Russia had entered the stage of socialist revolution after the February Revolution. The November Revolution proved beyond doubt

how correct was the revolutionary theory of Lenin.

Today it is clear as daylight that compared to the stage of development of capitalism in Russia in 1917, Indian capitalism is thousand times more developed. Except as hangover, as force of habit in the cultural and social sphere, feudalism does not exist in India at present, not even in agriculture. Is not the Indian revolution, therefore, thousand times more in the stage of socialist revolution?

Attention should be paid to another question in this connection. There are people among the advocates of the people's democratic revolution who close their eyes to the reality of the Indian revolution as being the socialist revolution and argue that the Indian state is not a national bourgeois state because of its economic dependence on the foreign imperialist countries. To expose the utter fallacy of this argument, Comrade Ghosh reminded us of Lenin's teaching on the question of determining the character of a national state, a question which drew Rosa Luxemburg into a debate with Kautsky. Lenin pointed out that in the present era of imperialism and proletarian revolution, owing to the law of uneven development of capitalism, a few capitalist countries had advanced much over other capitalist countries and were acting as leaders of the capitalist world—the leading imperialist countries on which the bourgeoisie of the newly independent countries were bound to be economically dependent. Lenin pointed out: "Not only small states, but even Russia, for example, is economically entirely dependent on the power of the imperialist finance capital of 'rich' bourgeois countries. Not only the miniature Balkan states but even America in the nineteenth century was economically a colony of Europe... but it has nothing whatever to do with the question of the national state." (The Right of Nations to Self-determination)

So, judging from all aspects, it has to be admitted that the Indian state is a national bourgeois state, the Indian bourgeoisie stands as the main obstacle in the path of emancipation of the exploited masses of our country. The main task of the Indian proletariat is to overthrow the bourgeoisie from the state power.

The practical importance of understanding the true stage of revolution of India and, therefore, the true task at present is beyond measure for workers, peasants, youths and students of our country, who are coming out to fight for their emancipation. Whom will they fight? Emphasizing this point Com. Shibdas Ghosh said: "If they consider that our revolution is people's democratic, then whatever slogans they may raise in platform speeches, however 'militant' struggles they may conduct, it is sure that from the very class alignment of their people's democratic revolution, they will develop a sympathy for and unity with the rich peasants in the villages. Consequently, the peasants' movements they conduct will inevitably come under the firm grip and influence of the rich peasants. To assume the Indian revolution to be people's democratic will lead them to hobnobbing with the rich peasants this way or that way, or to make adventure. This will not serve any purpose. Rather, by this, the class struggle of the poor and landless peasants and the agricultural labourers against the rich peasants, who are the mainstay of capitalism in the rural economy, will be weakened and the interests of the poor and landless peasants and the agricultural labourers will be sacrificed at the feet of the rich peasants. On the other hand, based on their fanciful theory of People's Democratic Revolution, on the assumed existence of progressive national bourgeoisie somewhere, they will be in search of this among the social high-ups who are, in fact, the pillar of capitalism and, by this, the party and their leaders will invariably develop and maintain close tie with them. May be behind the screen, but

happen it must. Outwardly, whatever may be the sacrifice of the rank and file members for the sake of revolution, this is bound to happen with their leaders inside the party, which may not be in the know of the rank and file members who make such sacrifice."

Evidently, therefore, parties like the CPI(M), CPI, etc. who are superimposing their fanciful theory of the people's democratic or national democratic revolution on the Indian stage are practising bourgeois reformism. Their political programme has nothing to do with the task of smashing the bourgeois state of our country. On the other hand, it is essential to bear in mind that the stage of revolution of our country is socialist revolution and we are in the democratic phase of this stage. In organising legitimate democratic mass movements as precursor to the revolutionary class struggle, it is the task of the Indian working class and all other sections of the toiling masses to build up a genuine left and democratic front as an instrument of mass struggle. But what should be the object of this united front? What should be the direction along which mass movements are to be conducted? Comrade Stalin explained: "A united front can be of revolutionary significance only when and only on condition that it does not prevent the communist party from conducting its independent political and organisational work, from organising the proletariat into an independent political force, from rousing the peasantry against the landlords, from openly organising a workers' and peasants' revolution, from preparing in this way the conditions for the hegemony of the proletariat". While explaining the Leninist strategy and tactics of revolution, Stalin showed that without isolating the compromising forces from the revolutionary movement, it is never possible to overthrow the enemy. In conducting united mass movements from the platform of the united front an essential task is, therefore, to carry out simultaneously an intense ideological struggle against the social democratic parties

and forces acting as the force of compromise between the bourgeoisie and the working class. The main blow in the period of preparation for revolution, as Stalin pointed out, has to be directed against the social democrats.

In the name of serving the interest of the people and chattering slogans of Marxism-Leninism, parties like the CPI(M), CPI, etc. are seen to be actually serving the interests of the ruling bourgeoisie, the main enemy of the Indian revolution. As an inevitable consequence of their fanciful theory of people's democratic or national democratic revolution, they have all along been busy seeking a 'progressive section' of the bourgeoisie. Once they identified the same in the Congress under Nehru, then in the Congress of Indira Gandhi, only recently in the Janata Party under Morarji Desai, and now in the Congress-Lok Dal combine under Charan-Chavan. In this way they have all along allied themselves with the known bourgeois parties, and now have openly come out to defend the ruling class in its hour of grave crisis. These parties are now saddled in government in some of the states and are playing the role of bourgeois caretaker of the state apparatus. They are crushing the legitimate democratic mass movements using the repressive arm of the state with all brutality. They are practising legalism and creating illusion about the parliamentary system. They are trying to confine mass movement within the walls of parliamentary system, creating doubt in the people's mind about revolution itself.

Yet some of these parties are seen celebrating the birth centenary of Comrade Stalin with all fanfare. But they are celebrating the birth centenary of Comrade Stalin minus his revolutionary teachings, minus the revolutionary ideology he stood for throughout his life. They are only appropriating the great name of Comrade Stalin to fulfil their opportunistic, social democratic aspirations. Can there be a worse example of denigrating Comrade Stalin than this ?

★

★

★

Movements have surged forth again and again against capitalist exploitation and oppression in our country. Again and again have the people plunged into them. But the movements have failed, failed again and again to reach their logical culmination. Where does lie the mistake ? Comrade Shibdas Ghosh pointed to the truth : ".....Our movements had not before them the correct base political line and the correct leadership. That is to say, all those movements had not before them the strategy and tactics of the anti-capitalist socialist revolution. So, whatever might have been the struggles on the demands of the people, they were in essence fights for some reforms within the bourgeois constitutional span, although the leaders passed them for 'revolution' to the people.....So, the fate of these movements has been what is but natural in the given condition. Political power of the people and the instruments of struggle of the exploited masses on the model of the Soviets did not grow up through these movements.By political power of the people I mean such politically conscious struggling committees of the exploited people in both villages and towns, who can perform any kind of work on the basis of base political line by exercising their own brains, initiatives and creativeness".

This is the course before the people of our country at present : To build up people's struggling committees, at all levels, as the real instrument of struggle. To develop mass struggle on the correct base political line of anti-capitalist socialist revolution and on the edifice of the high proletarian culture. To conduct higher mass struggle on a well thought-out plan, to prepare for a protracted battle. This is the task. This is the call of the Great November Socialist Revolution. Herein lies the real significance of celebrating the birth centenary of Comrade Stalin. This is what Comrade Stalin enjoins upon us.

Denigration of Stalin's Authority is denigration of revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism

Modern revisionists train their gun against Comrade J. V. Stalin, an outstanding leader of world proletarian movement, accusing him guilty of many crimes. By propagating a wholly biased view about Stalin, they denigrate the authority of Stalin with the sole motive of denouncing the revolutionary teachings of Marxism-Leninism in defence of which he fought for his whole life. On this occasion of birth centenary of Comrade Stalin, it will therefore be the bounden duty for all the genuine communists to recall and re-emphasise the positive aspects of Stalin's great role and contribution not only to imbibe the high values they represent but also to defeat the sinister motive of the revisionist trend that poses the main danger before the world proletarian movement.

Comrade J. V. Stalin's name will be remembered as a great Marxist-Leninist symbolising the mould of a giant revolutionary steeled in many battles, tortuous and complicated, with rare revolutionary courage of conviction and above all an unflinching devotion to the great cause of the proletariat.

Stalin's brilliant fight against Trotskyism

If Lenin was the great architect of world's first successful proletarian revolution, Stalin as his close comrade-in-arms not only played a very distinguished role in its success, but was also its resolute defender against all varieties of domestic and foreign class enemies for nearly three decades. Can anybody forget the gigantic struggle that Stalin had to lead after Lenin against those within the Soviet party and outside who challenged the very theoretical validity of development of socialism in a single country? Trotsky gave a mechanical interpretation to Marx's concept of 'permanent revolution' to argue that unless the Russian revolution was backed up immediately by revolutions at least in the West European countries, it was doomed to failure. Trotsky was holding out this bleak prospect at a time when the paramount question was not only to hold on firmly the Soviet state power by the Russian

proletariat but to make its all round further consolidation to meet the growing challenge arising out of the capitalist encirclement.

The proletariats of Russia had before them nothing other than the experiences and lessons of Paris Commune. Under the leadership of Lenin's revolutionary genius, they just overcame the imperialist incursions and counter-revolutionary attempts. In such a situation Trotsky's thesis was serving no other political purpose than telling the Russian toiling people that they had before them the options either to let pass the revolutionary state power out of their hands and wait for the revolutions to take place in European countries or to resort to misadventure of imposing on the European proletariats their revolutions through the march of Soviet army. In either case, it was in effect an advice to liquidate the Soviet power which exactly was being eagerly sought for by the imperialist-capitalists of the whole world. What more service to the bourgeoisie could be offered at that critical stage of the Russian revolution?

Lenin took up the fight against Trotsky in the ideological-political plane by propounding his famous theory of 'uneven development of capitalism' which makes possible breaching the chain of imperialism

capitalism even in a single country depending on the political organisational maturity of the proletariat of that country and combination of certain other internal and external favourable conditions. But he could not live long to give a crushing rebuff to Trotskyism as an ideological trend although the unfolding reality in Russia was already validating his theory. It was left to Stalin therefore, on whom the mantle fell after Lenin to translate Lenin's theory into practice and save the first proletarian revolution from the dangerous deviation that Trotskyism posed within the revolutionary movement of the proletariats. It stands to the credit of Stalin that he led the party through to victory in this test by giving forceful rebuff to Trotsky and his trend of thought both ideologically and organisationally. Without defeating this Trotskyite trend the revolutionary achievement of the proletariat in Russia could neither be saved nor could world proletarian movement advance a step further.

Against Bukharin's revisionist doctrine

It was not the only and last opposition from within the party that Stalin had to fight and defeat fairly and squarely. If Trotsky was virtually helping capitalis

by propagating 'hopelessness' of the Russian revolution thereby slackening the revolutionary initiative and weakening the morale of the proletariat, there were others waiting in the wings to do the same in a different way in the years to come. Bukharin raised the banner of revolt joined by big names in the Soviet party like Zinoviev, Kamenev, Raykov etc. In fact the so-called 'left' and 'right' trends mingled into one powerful bloc to oppose the correct revolutionary course at a crucial period of the fight of the Russian people. It was the hour of socialist reconstruction of the Russian society breaking the organised opposition of the capitalist elements—the NEPmen in the countryside. [New Economic Policy—Ed. P. Era] It was a decisive battle to transform NEP-Russia into Socialist Russia. Bukharin became the chief spokesman and defender of NEP Russia pleading for time and slackening the pace of socialist transformation. He was pleading so in the face of the gathering strength of the capitalist elements and the approaching danger of counter-revolutionary attempts on their part to subvert the Soviet power. It goes to the credit of Stalin of leading the party and the people to scotch this conspiracy of the capitalists for revival of capitalism. The economic plannings and

social political reconstructions that were undertaken under the leadership of Stalin created a powerful bullwark against capitalist restoration.

Fascist menace and his magnificent handling of world situation

The third significant achievement of Stalin which needs to be recalled was his masterly handling of contradictions between the imperialist powers e.g. the USA, Great Britain and France on one side and Fascist Germany, Italy and Japan on the other. The imperialist powers—all were unanimous on one point e.g. destruction of Soviet power, the bastion of world proletarian movement. The bourgeoisie and their agents did all their machinations to see the crumbling down of the Soviet power. But thanks to the great inspiring leadership of Stalin, the Soviet people demonstrated to the world the might of the working class state power and their revolutionary courage and determination. The Soviet Red Army not only repulsed the most mighty and barbarous attacks of fascist powers and thereby saved humanity from fascist menace, the worst enemy to civilisation, but cleared the path for liberation of the toiling people in Eastern Europe, China, as also helped tremendously the national liberation

movements in colonies. In fact, struck by the powerful blow of proletarian power the camp of imperialism-capitalism was reeling and the process of its further disintegration and disarray was set in motion. This released on the other hand the high tide of revolutionary movement, the world over. And Stalin was at the helm of world revolutionary movement at this finest hour of its success.

The history of world revolutionary movement of the proletariat cannot therefore be complete without proper appreciation of these concrete facts and experiences along with proper evaluation of the great historic role that Stalin played all through this trying period.

His great contribution in the theoretical field of Marxism-Leninism

As a great communist, Stalin has left behind an indelible mark not only as the expounder and elaborator of Leninism which is "Marxism in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution" but also by making his own important theoretical contributions on questions like nationality problem and linguistics, on the analysis of world capitalist system which was an improvement on Lenin's analysis, taking into cognition the new reality of disintegration and absence of relative stability

in world capitalist market, on the revolutionary exposition of the Leninist theory of peaceful co-existence as distinguished from the revisionist distortion of "Peaceful capitulationism" to imperialism-capitalism, on world peace movement with revolutionary objective and opposed to pacifism of the revisionists, "On Economic Problems of Socialism in USSR" in particular and the general laws of economics under socialism leading towards communist society, on party organisation and successful working of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat etc.

Attacks against Stalin's Authority

Three years after the death of Stalin, at the 20th Party Congress of CPSU, Krushchov renegade clique that usurped the leadership of the party dealt a severe blow to communist movement by hurling all sorts of wild charges personally against Stalin to undermine his authority on the plea of "combating the personality cult."

In the most arduous tasks of defending the world's first working class state against the counter-revolutionary plots and conspiracies of the imperialist-capitalists and their agents both within and outside Soviet Union, in giving concrete shape and laying the solid foundation of the nascent socialist state,

in conducting the world communist movement as the leader of the Comintern at a very trying period, not that Stalin did not commit mistakes and at times very serious ones. Our party under the leadership of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, the most esteemed and beloved founder general secretary of our party and an outstanding Marxist thinker of the era, from a spirit of self-criticism within the communist camp, drew the most urgent and serious attention of the international proletarian movement in general and its leadership in particular, to the mechanical process of thinking and method of organisation which were very much prevalent in it and urged for its immediate rectification to establish dialectical relationship between the leadership and the rank and file members within individual communist parties as also between the leading communist party CPSU and other fraternal communist parties. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh made this very important pointer as far back as 1948 during Comrade Stalin's life time when to raise an issue even in the spirit of self-criticism with the sole object of strengthening the communist movement was frowned upon by the united communist party leadership in our country as an act of disloyalty to communist movement in general and

dishonouring the authority of Stalin in particular.* Not becoming a victim to this mechanical concept of authority which speaks of blind obedience to leadership, our party led by Comrade Ghosh also pointed out the mistaken readings and decisions of the Comintern on Germany and China** as also defective method of handling of Tito incident and placed our own readings for serious consideration. All these had nothing to do to denigrate the authority of Stalin as the respected leader of international communist movement but on the contrary, were meant to remove the serious shortcomings and defective methods in the ideological-political field of activities which were discernible in the international communist movement. What is of much importance, the erroneous and harmful mechanical sense of authority prevalent in the international communist movement was pointed out by our party led by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh. Comrade Ghosh drew the urgent and serious attention of the leadership of the communist movement that the Leninist principle of evolving the general international line through dialectical method of interaction of ideas between the communist parties of different

* "Self-criticism of Communist Camp"—an article of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, first published in 1948.

** Please see at the end of the article.

countries had been virtually given a good bye and instead the practice and convention of accepting without critical examination the analysis of international situation by just one or two leading communist parties as the general international line of revolution was being followed. This gave rise to mechanical sense of authority in the international communist movement in place of a conscious recognition of authority based on dialectical relationship. But the irony of history is this that those very leaders of the then united CPI and now the top leaders of both CPI and CPI(M) who were very much up against our party for this 'audacity' to point out shortcomings and mistakes in the international communist movement and even tried to paint us as 'anti-c o m m u n i s t' 'anti-Stalinist' so on and so forth did not hesitate for a moment to join in the chorus of anti-Stalin tirade, the moment, Krushchov revisionist clique unleashed it from the platform of the 20th Party Congress of CPSU. Since then, even today, both the CPI and CPI(M) party leaders in our country joining with the revisionists the world over, have been chewing the cud of 'personal dictatorship' of Stalin as also his so-called crimes of authoritarian high-handedness, so on and so forth—the calumnies that

were sedulously propagated during Stalin's life-time by the bourgeoisie and their hirelings. We may recall here what Comrade Shibdas Ghosh said pointing out to these revisionists after 20th Party Congress of CPSU: "Those who made Stalin at one time almost a demi-God did not hesitate to pull him down to dust". All this they did because of a mechanical conception of authority that denies struggle or a dialectical relationship between the leader and the led. It was therefore far from being a conscious recognition of authority of the leader which Marxism calls for.

20th Party Congress will open the flood gate of revisionism—historic warning of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, proved correct

History demands recalling the fact that at this dark hour in international communist movement when no other communist party could grasp fully the grave danger concealed in the so-called slogan of 'De-Stalinisation', our party came out guided by the great revolutionary foresight of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh in defence of Stalin's authority and all that it meant in the revolutionary movement of the proletariat. On the morrow of 20th Party Congress of CPSU, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh in his historic speech (20th May 1956, first pub-

lished in Ganadabi, our Bengali Organ on 24th July, '56) alerted the international communist movement that unless the various revisionist propositions and orientation were vigorously fought out this 20th Party Congress of CPSU would "open the floodgate of revisionism". History has vindicated his reading. We need hardly to recapitulate the relevant readings and conclusions of our party at that time because they are all open documents and are fairly well known among the Marxist circles not only in our country but abroad.*

'Present understanding of Leninism as distinct from Social-democracy and Trotskyism is due to Stalin'—Comrade Shibdas Ghosh

We may just recall here the tribute that Comrade Shibdas Ghosh paid to Stalin on behalf of our party with which, we believe, the genuine communists all over the world will be in full accord: "... ..the present understanding of Leninism as distinct from Social-democracy and Trotskyism is due to Stalin.Stalin's understanding of Leninism is the understanding of all the communists of Marxism-Leninism....."

"To black Stalin out will

* "Twentieth Congress of CPSU" (1956)

"On Steps Taken Against Stalin" (1962)

have the inevitable result of disowning his authority and consequently rejecting his interpretation of Leninism, which is the present day understanding of Marxism-Leninism. It will objectively uncrown Lenin himself".—(‘On Steps Taken Against Stalin’, March, 1962)

Aftermath of 20th Congress—new world wide wave of revisionism

Later, after the counter-revolutionary attempts and subsequent events in Czechoslovakia Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, in a very important speech (dated 26th August, 1968) discussed among other things the dialectical approach to assessment of the character of a revolutionary and more so of a giant revolutionary like Stalin. Comrade Ghosh has shown that even those who are opposed to revisionism but put undue emphasis on the negative side of Stalin are guilty of subjective reasoning. For, dialectical method of reasoning demands studying a character in the concrete perspective of the contradiction between the positive and the negative aspects. This alone can give a total view about the structural shape of the character. To study the negative side in isolation means not to study it in its contradiction with the positive and slipping into subjectivism, blinding of vision and consequently

biased conclusion. It is like putting the cart before the horse and is therefore purposeless from a revolutionary objective. As revolutionaries we should know that even a revolutionary leader may have negative side but so long he remains a revolutionary leader it is the positive side of his character that is in command and patterns the negative aspect accordingly. But when it is just the reverse he degenerates and ceases to be revolutionary. In case of Stalin, it was never his negative side but always the positive side that was in command. We, as revolutionaries, must take lessons from the positive aspects of a great revolutionary leader to imbibe and further enrich through our struggles and experiences the values reflected in those positive aspects of a leader. Besides, we must know that mere recanting of negative aspects cannot remove them. Negative can be fought only by helping the positive to grow.

Uncrowning Stalin's authority means uncrowning Lenin himself said Comrade Ghosh

We need therefore recapitulate a few facts of history just to show the utter venality as also absurdity of the charges that were once hurled against Stalin during his life time by the Trotskyites and Mensheviks and after his death repeated by the revisionists led by Krushchov.

Mr. EMS Namboodiripad, the General Secretary of CPI(M) not only subscribes to these accusations against Stalin but is also an ardent propagator of those in our country. In several of his articles and speeches he has accused Stalin of having tried to usurp to his "personal credit" all the "victories of revolution" and that he had become in his later life, swollen-headed, authoritarian, so on and so forth.

(Vide his article in Chintha, Sept. 2, 79. & the obituary note on Mao-Tse-tung etc.)

Now as to the charge of 'personal dictatorship' of a leader of a revolutionary party, Lenin once commented that "To go so far... as to counterpose in general dictatorship of the masses to dictatorship of the leaders is ridiculously absurd and stupid".

(“Leftwing Communism and Infantile disorder”—Lenin works Vol XXV)

CPI(M) leaders' anti-Stalin tirade

Yet, Mr. Namboodiripad like his revisionist fellow-travellers goes on repeating this "ridiculously absurd and stupid" accusation against Stalin. Is it simply because of his total innocence of the Marxian concept of authority and its concrete expression within a proletarian party? This apart, Mr. Namboodiripad

does not hide his petty-bourgeois predilection for ultra-democracy like the revisionists of the past and the present. But to accuse Stalin of having degenerated to a dictator usurping to his personal credit all the victories of revolution and at the same time to pay ritualistic homage on his birth centenary is the height of unethical conduct, to say the least. Yet this is what exactly, CPI(M) under the 'profound' leadership of Mr. Namboodiripad is doing. It smacks of pragmatic consideration of befooling and misguiding the party ranks and the people who hold Stalin in high esteem. But the real communists will not be fooled by this trick of the revisionists, a section of which like the CPI(M) leadership even takes the name of Stalin and oppose the very revolutionary teachings of Marxism Stalin stood for all through his life. They will instead search for the causes of mistakes and reverses in the communist movement in Stalin's time. If they do so, it would be clear to them that the mistakes and shortcomings in the theoretical-organisational fields during Stalin's time were not so much due to him personally but due mainly to the shortcomings of the communist movement in general and the non-dialectical mechanical functioning within CPSU in particular. Some of the serious mistakes

in ideological-organisational questions came to the notice of Stalin and he set before the party the task of removing those.

Stalin's fight against bureaucratism and other vices

Stalin pointed out on several occasions that the bureaucratic attitude was developing in the party functionaries to whom "dismissing some and putting others in their place" seemed to be "the essence of democracy". It was according to Stalin, due to lack of understanding that the party was "an independently acting organism" and not like "a system of official institution." He always placed emphasis on raising the ideological cultural standard of party cadres to rectify these defects. Stalin said: "The surest remedy for bureaucracy is raising the cultural level of workers and peasantry. One can curse and denounce bureaucracy in our practical work, but unless the masses of the workers reach a certain level of culture, which will create the possibility, the desire, the ability to control the state apparatus from below, by the masses of the workers themselves, bureaucracy will continue to exist in spite of everything." —[Fifteenth Congress of CPSU(B), Stalin works vol. 10]

At the Seventeenth Congress of CPSU, Stalin set

before the party as immediate task: "to overcome the survivals of capitalism in economic life and in the minds of people" and warned:

"It stands to reason that these survivals cannot but create favourable soil for the revivals of the ideology of the defeated anti-Leninist groups in the minds of individual members of our party." And, "It goes without saying that if this confusion of mind and those non-Bolshevik sentiments obtained a hold over the majority of our party, the party would find itself demobilised and disarmed.

—(Report to the Seventeenth Congress of CPSU).

Nationalist deviation and denunciation of revolutionary teachings of Marxism by modern revisionists

However painful it may be, yet it is a fact of history that after the death of Stalin the anti-Leninist trend of thoughts, revived and took hold of the Soviet Party and affected later the international communist movement. It was possible mainly because of the prevalence of bourgeois humanism and bourgeois sense of moral values in the ethical cultural fields of the communist movement about which Comrade Shibdas Ghosh uttered the historic warning during the Tito incident in 1948. The inadequacy and shortcoming

in the ideological cultural fields of international communist movement provided the fertile soil for the revival of this new wave of revisionist-trend spearheaded by Krushchov renegade clique. The jubilation of the revisionists within the communist movement found expression in Tito who in course of a speech in November 1956 said. "It is a question now whether this course (referring to 20th Party Congress formulation—Ed. P.Era) will be victorious or whether the Stalinist Course will prevail again." Tito boasted fully claimed in the same speech that this new trend, meaning the revisionist trend, 'really begun in Yugoslavia.'

What really begun in Yugoslavia was nothing but nationalist deviation or for that matter national orientation of a party calling itself communist which is directly opposed to the spirit of internationalism and goal of communist ideology and movement. For this offence, Tito was expelled from Cominform. Now after Stalin, what was impermissible and a crime for a communist party was made a guiding line by the revisionist leaderships of the old communist parties, throughout the world. Togliatti of Italian communist party only gave a new term to this national narrow-mindedness in his slogan of 'polycentricism'. Distorting the true meaning and concept

of "different paths of socialism", the communist movement was emasculated by taking out of it, the revolutionary soul. Like the 'heroes' of the Second International the revisionist leaderships of these parties led by the leadership of CPSU renounced the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism like forcible overthrow of the bourgeoisie by revolutionary uprising of the exploited masses, establishment and consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the basic precondition for the revolutionary transformation of the society from capitalist to communist one. Instead they floated the rotten revisionist formulation like peaceful transition to socialism keeping in tact the bourgeois state apparatus and the parliament. They deny the leading role of the communist party in this period of revolutionary transformation and chew the cud of liberal bourgeois slogan of democracy in general and pass bourgeois reformism for socialism. They also betray their petty-bourgeois outlook of ultra-democracy on the question of sense of authority and its concrete expression within the proletarian party, implying the party to be nothing but a federation of groups, ideologically politically lax and unprepared for conducting a life and death struggle against the onslaughts of utterly reactionary moribund capitalism.

Combating the liberal-bourgeois fetishism of democracy of K a u t s k y, Lenin said, "democracy sometimes stands for the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, sometimes for the impotent reformism of the petty-bourgeoisie which submits to that dictatorship" (Lenin—"Proletarian Revolution And Renegade Kautsky.")

Today, the latter portion of Lenin's remark aptly suits the position of the revisionist parties who in Europe hang the sign board of 'Euro-Communism' and in our country go by the names of CPI and CPI(M). These parties have degenerated to parties of establishment, wholly submerged under bourgeois reformism and are in reality acting as the last prop of moribund capitalism. They use the signboard of 'Marxism' or 'Communism' and take the names of Lenin or Stalin in their lips just to exploit the good feelings and esteem of the people about this noble ideology and the leaders.

Serious ideological confusion within present day communist movement

But thanks to these revisionist leaderships, a good deal of confusion has been created on vital ideological political questions in communist movement. The bourgeoisie and its agents are exploiting this confusion to demoralise and weaken the

revolutionary movement of the proletariat. This they did in the past too, as mistakes and temporary shortcomings in the communist movement are nothing new. But real revolutionaries are never disheartened because of the mistakes and temporary reverses. They, instead go deep into the causes of those mistakes and setbacks. This inherent vitality of the revolutionary movement has demonstrated its invincibility. History testifies to this fact. Marx laid the foundation of Marxism, Engels defended and enriched it. Lenin developed and enriched it further when he had to face the concrete task of leading the proletarian revolution in Russia and laying the foundation of new-born socialist state.

In our time, the communist movement is face to face with some newer and serious problems on ideological cultural questions without giving adequate answers to which, it can not advance to its revolutionary goal and objective. The experiences of the Soviet Party and society after Stalin not only pointed out the inadequacy and shortcomings remaining within the communist movement but also the urgency of their solutions. Two cardinal questions are involved here. First, what is the real understanding of Marxist concept of authority within a revolutionary proletarian party—its process of deve-

lopment, concrete shape and functioning which alone can save the party from anarchist trend of negation of authority or ultra-democracy? Secondly, what is the ideological-cultural content of proletarian ethics and sense of values that alone can defeat and remove the survivals of capitalism in the economy as also in thought-process and sense of values of party and non-party masses in a socialist society? It goes without saying that these are the two very important questions on which absence of adequate theoretical cultural foundation in the CPSU provided the fertile soil for the revival of social-democratic deviation that later engulfed the entire communist movement. On both these questions, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, the founder General Secretary of our party and an outstanding Marxist thinker of the era has made historic contributions to bring the understandings of Marxism-Leninism to a new height.

We propose to deal with these questions, in brief, tracing the stage to stage developments of this concept from Marx's time to our time.

Marxist concept of Authority

Karl Marx laid the foundation of Marxist philosophy based on the scientific law of social development from the class rule of the

capitalists to a classless communist society, free from all sorts of coercion. His fundamental proposition that runs through the Communist Manifesto forms the core of Marxism. Marx and Engels had to fight for their whole life to establish the ideological authority of Marxism against the so-called "universal panaceas of manifold types of social quacks" who wanted to eliminate social abuses of capitalist society through all kinds of "patch-work, without hurting capital and profit in the least." (Engels: Preface to German Edition, 1890 of the Manifesto of Communist Party)

Marx's historic contribution to discovering the scientific law of social development to communist society free from class exploitations and coercions of all sorts, ensuring real freedom and emancipation of man lay in his coming to the conclusion that: "Only when man gains a knowledge of his 'own forces' and organises them as social force so that he no longer separates the *social force* from himself in the form of *political force* only then will man's emancipation come about" (Marx-'On the Jewish question'—December 1843)

But how can this be accomplished? By mere criticism of the bourgeoisie as the petty-bourgeois parliamentary opposition parties would like to do?

No, for, in the words of Marx "...the weapon of criticism is no substitute for criticism by weapons and material force must needs be overthrown by material force." (Marx: "A contribution to the critique of Hegel's philosophy of law, Introduction"—J a n u a r y, 1844)

The revolutionary role of Marxism and the proletarian class

In this onward and upward march of society the class that can carry through the emancipation of mankind and society must be the one "whose claims and rights.... are truly the rights and claims of the society itself" that is to say, the class which cannot enslave itself without therefore emancipating the whole society. This class is the proletariat.

Outlining the historic course of development of society Marx showed that it could only be under the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat" which is nothing but "the period of the revolutionary transformation between capitalist and communist society" as also "a political transition period in which the "state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."

—(Marx: Critique of the Gotha Programme)

Pointing out the inter-relationship between the philosophy of Marxism and

the proletariat which are destined to play the revolutionary role in history, Marx showed: "Just as philosophy finds in the proletariat its **material** weapon so the proletariat finds in philosophy its **spiritual weapon**" and **theory becomes a material force as soon as it takes hold of the masses.**"

—(A contribution to the critique of Hegel's philosophy of Law. Introduction. emphasis added)

So, even at this earliest period of communist movement, the importance of authority of the proletarian outlook and approach was stressed upon by Marx and Engels. From the above extracts, it is obvious that Marx clearly viewed that the establishment of political authority of the proletariat as the state power which is the 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat' was the essential precondition to changes in material conditions to take place for ushering in a communist society. And in this revolutionary struggle the theory which is the, spiritual weapon of the proletariat will itself become the material force of history when it establishes its hold or authority over the masses. But along with this authority of Marxism both in the ideological and political fields the question of its concrete expression within the communist movement was there which Engels had to

deal when some of his admirers from a wrong conception wanted to rechristen Marxism as 'Marxism-Engelsism' in an attempt to give recognition to Engels' contributions to the development of the philosophy and the communist movement. Engels not only debunked this idea by asserting that the basic proposition of Marxism belongs "solely and exclusively to Marx" but also called Marx the 'brain' of the movement during his lifetime. Here was therefore a conscious recognition of the authority of Marx in the communist movement by Engels who after the death of Marx was similarly the accepted authority in the international communist movement.

Anarchist negation of authority—trend of ultra-democracy

The anarchists led by Bakunin, opposed the conception of authority in general and the political authority of the proletariat in the state power after the working class revolution, in particular. Giving a sharp rebuff to the anarchists, Engels asked: "Whoever mentions combined action, speaks of organisation; now **is it possible to have organisation without authority?**" But the anarchists demand: "...the authoritarian political state be abolished at one stroke even before the social conditions

that give birth to it have been destroyed". According to them, authority even if it is "voluntarily bestowed must cease simply because it is authority". According to Engels—however, as *'one deciding will'* in the last resort, as *"a unified direction"*, "no matter how delegated" authority is essential to which "a certain subordination", "independent of all social organisations" is imposed on us.

[Engels: "On Authority" (1872) and Letter to Theodor Cuno, 24th January, 1872—*italics ours.*]

In all these can be found the earliest conceptual framework of Marxian sense of authority which has since been developed at the hands of later Marxian thinkers. The principal points involved here are as to how this authority is developed and functions in the concrete form of leadership within the proletarian party and how it functions in the relation between the party and the masses. Is it something imposed to which a certain subordination is called for or is it something evolved through the process of struggle and conscious recognition, symbolising the 'unity of will' and 'unified direction' of the movement?

Describing the relationship of the proletarian party with the masses as of 'mutual confidence' Lenin showed that the authority of the

proletarian party over the class and the masses is not based on force but it is the expression of the 'united will' of the class itself that works as the "guide, the leader, the teacher of the working class".

Explaining this further, he showed, ".....not a single class in history has achieved power without producing its political leaders; its prominent representatives able to organize a movement and lead it." And "without this, the dictatorship of the proletariat, its 'unity of will' remains a phrase".—(Lenin collected works Vol. 4)

Lenin pointed out the methods of collective leadership and democratic centralism for the development and concretisation of this 'unity of will' of the proletariat inside its party. It is not just formal democracy of submission of the minority to the majority or taking decision in a collective body as the revisionists try to interpret. Elaborating on the question Stalin showed that the authority of the party over the mass of the workers and peasantry is not based on force, rather force kills it. It is based on people's confidence built up by "party's correct theory, by the party's correct policy, by the party's devotion to the working class, by its connection with the masses of the working class, by its readiness and ability to convince the masses of the

correctness of its slogans."

—(Concerning Questions of Leninism, January, 1926)

It is therefore "conscious democracy, the method of proletarian democracy, which is only correct method" as opposed to "Trotsky's 'democracy' which is forced, half-hearted and unprincipled and as such merely supplements the military-bureaucratic method"—(Our Disagreement, an article, January, 1921)

Within the party this proletarian democracy works, Stalin pointed out, through the method of 'persuasion and not by the administrative method.' Besides, the defects and mistakes within the party should not be settled by the "family circle method" of hushing up each other's mistakes. They should be rectified and eradicated by "honest and straight-forward self-criticism and open correction". Otherwise he said: "We shall cease to be proletarian revolutionaries" and "shall certainly perish" by closing "our road to progress, to the improvement of our work and to new successes in our work."

—[Stalin—Fifteenth Congress Report of CPSU(B)]

Pointing out the true relationship between the leaders and the cadres in a proletarian party Stalin advised his German Comrades that "....It is not good when the leaders of the party are feared but not respected. Party leaders can be real

leaders only if they are not feared but respected in the party, when their authority is recognised." And "it is absolutely essential otherwise the party cannot be called a real Bolshevik party, and the discipline of the party cannot be conscious discipline".—(A Letter to Comrade ME-RT Vol 7, p 45)

Does it smack of anything authoritarian' in Stalin or shows his resolute opposition to authoritarian method? Discretion being the better part of valour, the revisionists prefer to avoid this question. There are others who practise 'national socialism' but call themselves revolutionary socialists, try to draw a line between Lenin and Stalin and make a show of their allegiance to Lenin while opposing Stalin. But can they show concrete facts where Stalin deviated from Lenin on vital questions of ideology and principles of Marxism-Leninism? No, they cannot. Facts of history are more powerful than fictions.

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh has developed the party science to a new height to combat the petty-bourgeois trend within the communist movement by making a thorough and scientific analysis of concepts of democratic centralism and collective leadership. Comrade Ghosh has shown that the concept of democratic centralism connotes two things—ideological centra-

lism and organisational centralism. Ideological centralism grows "out of the struggle to develop one process of thinking, uniformity of thinking, oneness in approach and singleness of purpose based on Marxism-Leninism and Dialectical Materialism not only on economic and political questions but on all questions covering all aspects of life. When a party through such an all-out struggle, has been able to develop this ideological centralism then and then only it can be said that the principle of democratic centralism is operating inside the party...when organisational centralism is built up on the basis of this ideological centralism, which makes the proletarian democracy effective, it gives the real structural shape to the principle of democratic centralism inside the party".

(Shibdas Ghosh: "Why SUCI is the only genuine Communist party in India"—1978)

From this it is obvious that democratic centralism within a revolutionary party of the working class is not just adoption of a model democratic constitution or exercise of majority minority principle in actual functioning. The basic precondition for the existence of democratic centralism is the struggle of the rank and file members with the leadership in the form of "discussions in dialogue" which in its

turn makes a definite ideological cultural standard of the rank and file members, an indispensable necessity in absence of which they cannot be expected to engage themselves in such struggle nor can the principle of democratic centralism be saved from being reduced to empty phrase and formalism.

Now the question is what is the concrete form of the sense of authority within a proletarian party that evolves, takes concrete shape and functions through this process of democratic centralism? How is it different in character and method of functioning from that obtaining in non-proletarian party? These are the vital questions in party organisational matters as well as in understanding the Marxian concept of authority. Lenin said that the collective knowledge of all the members of the party is collective leadership. Further elaborating and developing this Leninist teaching, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh has shown: "*...the concept of collective leadership or the sense of authority can never be abstract. And for this reason, when we say that collective leadership has emerged in a party we mean that the collective knowledge of the party has been personified in the best way in an individual of the party. So, the leader of the party in whom the collective knowledge of the party finds*

its best and concretised expression, is the thinker, the leader, the teacher and guide of the party. ...And only when such a personification of the collective knowledge and experience of the party takes a concrete shape an objective condition is created inside the party for the elimination of individualism, individual leadership and groupism from the party life and the party can be said to have established the norms of proletarian democracy and given birth to collective leadership only at this stage."

—(Shibdas Ghosh: "Why SUCI is the only genuine Communist Party in India" pp 19-21)

The petty-bourgeois democrats masquerading as 'communists' in our country like the leaders of CPI(M) and CPI have raised a hue and cry to this scientific theoretical foundation of the Leninist concept of collective leadership of a proletarian party given by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh because it strikes at the very root of the trend of anarchic negation of the sense of authority and ultra-democracy. They raise the clamour that this 'personification of collective knowledge' or the 'leader of leaders' concept means 'authoritarianism' or 'individual dictatorship' of a leader and kills the 'freedom' within a proletarian party. Just as the vulgarisers of Marxism, in the past took the name of

great leaders of the proletariat (to exploit their authority of course !) to oppose the development and enrichment of revolutionary teachings of Marxism so also in our country, the revisionists like CPI(M)'s General Secretary, E. M. S. Namboodiripad takes the name of Lenin in their opposition to this scientific and upto date most developed concept about collective leadership provided by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh.

They have utterly confused the proletarian concept of democracy with bourgeois democracy. So their opposition to concretisation of authority through struggles and interactions within a proletarian party as also their cries for 'freedom' have their ideological-cultural root in bourgeois individualism and sense of bourgeois moral values. They lack the basic theoretical understanding as to the fundamental difference that exists between the proletarian as opposed to bourgeois concept of leadership representing two distinctly opposed class objectives and social revolutions. Comrade Ghosh has shown this basic difference in his brilliant exposition that :

".....a bourgeois revolution is a revolutionary transformation of productive forces and mode of production based on individual ownership over means of production and is after all, a revolution to ensure deve-

lopment of the individual and establishment of the individual rights....For this reason as individual leadership is established in the name of democracy, in bourgeois democracy its character is nothing but formal.

.....But as the object of socialist revolution is to establish social ownership and as it is a revolution to establish collective control over the means of production under the leadership of the proletariat, the concept of leadership in proletarian democracy is bound to be collective."

(Ibid p 19)

The social-democratic deviation of the revisionists fails to distinguish this concept of 'leader of leaders' or the 'concretised expression of collective knowledge' within a revolutionary proletarian party, from the individual leadership in bourgeois democracy and their opposition amounts to negation of the sense of authority. They suffer as Engels showed in his book "Socialism utopian and scientific" from a utopian idea of equality in intellectual abilities of individuals. Giving a scientific basis to this concept of concretised expression of collective leadership or the concrete form of authority in the revolutionary movement of the proletariat, Comrade Ghosh has shown : ".....as no two phenomena in this material world can be identical so, too, the degree

of understanding of [the collective knowledge and experiences gained through struggles cannot be the same for all of them", particularly in the existing condition of society. So, the individual through whom personification of this collective knowledge and experiences takes the best form of expression emerges as the concrete form of expression of the collective leadership, through constant interaction and struggles within the party. This, therefore, can by no stretch of imagination be compared to individual leadership of a bourgeois leader.

In his celebrated book "Cultural Revolution of China", while discussing the indispensable necessity of the method of projecting an individual as 'the leader' to inspire the party workers and the people in their revolutionary struggles at the present stage of social development, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh has shown that :

"Revolution will be free from this limitation only when the level of consciousness of every individual member of society will be raised to the level of social consciousness, when individual consciousness will be identified with social consciousness, when the party and the individual entity will become one and the same, that is, when society as a whole and the party have become identified and the gap

between the highest and the lowest levels of consciousness has been eliminated. Only then the historic role of an individual as a leader to inspire and imbue people to discharge their social responsibility will cease to exist."

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh has made the historic contribution to the revolutionary movement of the proletariat by not only laying the firm theoretical foundation to the Marxian concept of authority in its concretised form but has also pointed out that its opposition from the revisionists stems from moribund bourgeois sense of values and ethics that gives rise to vulgar individualism in the present-day bourgeois society. He has pointed out further the truth which is of historic importance that even the socialist society is not free from the impact of bourgeois humanistic thinking, ethics and as a result a phenomenon like 'socialist individualism', which he coined to show the difference in material condition, is appearing there. Capitalism is finding a favourable soil in this individualism for its revival and revisionism is nothing but the impact of this bourgeois trend of thoughts and culture on the communist movement, the danger of which appeared in Soviet Society after the death of Stalin. This cannot be fought out and eradicated by invoking bourgeois humanism or the old standard of communist movement. Only

higher proletarian ethics and culture can accomplish this task. That is why an uncompromising and life and death struggle against bourgeois individualism, sense of values and culture by higher proletarian ethics and culture is an indispensable and urgent task before the revolutionary movement of the proletariat. The struggle begins with the very struggle to form a revolutionary party of the proletariat involving all aspects of life in order to make it truly the advanced detachment of the class. In socialist society this struggle takes the bigger dimension in social movements through successive cultural revolutions guiding and leading the people for identification and ultimate merger of their individual interests with social interests to lay the foundation of classless communist society. And only in this classless society mankind will have its real emancipation when it will enjoy true freedom, free from coercions of man by man. Before that the authoritarian institution, the state and the class instrument, the party will wither away. This is the historic course of social development which no amount of revisionist distortions can alter. The revisionist denial of authority in the revolutionary movement as also its political form the Dictatorship of the proletariat seeks, in reality, to perpetuate the authoritarianism of the capitalist class.

While analysing the roots of modern social democratism, revisionism, reformism Comrade Shibdas Ghosh through his brilliant expositions laid bare the fact that mechanisation in the process of thinking and process of organisation, lowering of ideological-cultural standard, persistence of bourgeois concept of democracy, liberalisation and nationalist mental make-up, morals and ethics and such other serious confusions and shortcomings in the ideological-cultural fields had in the main been instrumental in creating a breeding ground of the trend of revisionism-reformism. In this connection he further showed that the sense of ultra-nationalist feeling which remained subdued during Stalin's life-time owing to a fierce ideological struggle raised its ugly head when the revisionist leadership of CPSU, in the name of fighting the cult of individual, undertook the programme of 'De-Stalinisation.' It not only seriously undermined the authority of Stalin but the sense of authority in general in the international communist movement and contributed much for the rise of a powerful revisionist trend in the communist movement all over the world.

[On recent incidents in Hungary—an article by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, 5th Nov. 1956]

This resulted in serious setback and obstacles in the revolutionary movement of the proletariat. But this cannot but be a passing phase. The inherent vitality of the revolutionary movement is sure to assert. This vitality of the proletarian movement has again and again found concrete expressions in the development and enrichment of Marxism, at the hands of the giant communist thinkers. Today it is finding concrete expression in the thoughts and teachings of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh.

Comrade Stalin allthrough his life stood in defence of continual development and enrichment of Marxism to defeat the revisionist attempts of reducing it to set formula. Time and again he has enjoined on the revolutionaries of the necessity of taking lessons from past mistakes and shortcomings and to overcome those by higher ideological-cultural consciousness and clearer political understandings. That is why the tribute to Comrade Stalin will be real only by grasping the developments and enrichments of Marxism made by Comrade Ghosh in our time.

Like the revisionists in the past, the modern revisionists who oppose this development and enrichment of Marxism reveal their elemental opposition to the revolutionary soul of Marxism. Under their dispensation, the party though communist in name is reduced

to parliamentary reformist party, making a final break with the revolutionary goal and objective of communist ideology and the spirit of internationalism of proletarian movement. At their hands collective leadership becomes nothing more than consensus among disparate thinkings of different groups within the party. Instead of raising continuously the ideological-cultural standard of the party ranks, blind obedience, fanaticism, individualistic trends etc. are encouraged providing a fertile soil for mechanical thought process and authoritarianism inside the party. Prospects of self and privileges in bourgeois parliamentarism, individual ambitions and careerisms of the leaders bind them in a formal unity but is imposed on the party worst kind of authoritarianism notwithstanding the formalities of party congress or plenum. Denial of criticism and self-criticism to party members, absence of dialectical relationship between the leaders and cadres, bourgeois life styles and unethical conducts in public life of the leaders and unthinkable lowering of ideological-political standard make the mockery of the revolutionary concepts of a proletarian party. Such has been the fate of the revisionist parties like CPI(M) and CPI in our country and their counterparts in other countries. The petty-bourgeois democrats fight the sense of authority

and have begotten authoritarianism, instead. And in the words of Engels! "This thinkers mock at the whole world".

** This refers to the wrong political assessment of situations in Germany and China by the Comintern. In 1924, when revolutionary situation matured in Germany, at the advice of the Comintern, the German communist Party entered into a coalition government with the social-democrats despite the opposition of German Communist leader Brandley. Later within a year or so, this policy of alliance with the social democrats was changed and they were branded as social-fascists. Not only this slipping into adventurism, the German Communist Party, isolated from all leftist forces, made an abortive attempt for insurrection. Exploiting this blunders of the Communist party German Fascists took hold of the state power just a few years after.

In case of China also, after the Japanese War of aggression was defeated, Comintern's advice to CPC was not to proceed immediately for a decisive battle against the national bourgeoisie but to enter into a coalition with it for gaining further strength. The CPC was however preparing for the decisive battle which it carried through to success. After the victory of the Chinese revolution, Stalin as a true communist admitted his mistake and congratulated the Chinese Comrades for not accepting his advice mechanically. —[Editor, Proletarian Era]

"The dictatorship of the proletariat is not mere change of personalities in the government, a change of 'cabinet' etc, leaving the old economic and political order intact. The Mensheviks and opportunists of all countries, who fear dictatorship like fire and in their fright substitute the concept 'conquest of power' for the concept dictatorship, usually reduce the 'conquest of power' to a change of the 'cabinet', to the accession to power of a new ministry made up of people like Scheidemann and Noske Macdonald and Henderson. It is hardly necessary to explain that these and similar cabinet changes have nothing in common with the dictatorship of the proletariat, with the conquest of real power by the real proletariat."

—J. V. Stalin

Comrade Stalin's brilliant fight against both left and right deviations and its relevance in present day revolutionary movement

On this occasion of the birth centenary of Comrade J. V. Stalin, a great revolutionary leader of the world proletariat, genuine revolutionaries and the people at large all over the world will particularly remember with reverence his life-long great fight against Trotskyism-Menshevism and all other shades of social democratic deviations to uphold the revolutionary banner of Marxism-Leninism and defend the world's first socialist state. It would be worthwhile to recapitulate his great fight against social democratic deviations in order to draw appropriate lessons for our fight against modern revisionism.

We are to remember further that just as Lenin had to fight against those who, taking the names of Marx and Engels, tried to vulgarise Marxism so also Stalin had to wage ceaseless battles against those who used to take Lenin's name but denounced his revolutionary teachings. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, in our time, while defending the revolutionary banner of Marxism-Leninism had to fight relentlessly against the modern revisionists who denounce Stalin to denounce the revolutionary teachings he stood for in his whole life. Herein lies the significance of recalling Stalin's fight against social democracy as also its relevance to the fight against modern revisionism in our time.

Since Karl Marx propounded the theory of proletarian revolution, there began within the working class movement, struggle between genuine Marxism and sham Marxism, between genuine revolutionaries and pseudo-revolutionaries.

Revolutionaries at every stage had to wage fierce struggle against enemies of revolution

In each and every era, the revolutionaries had to launch struggles against revisionists and reformists who attempted to distort the revolutionary essence of Marxism, by obscuring the revolutionary teachings of this theory, its revolutionary soul, and vulgarising it.

In each and every era, the revolutionaries had to fight against these enemies of revolution, who, camouflaging themselves as revolutionaries, remained within the movement and tried to backstab it from within.

And it is only by defeating these forces that revolutionary theory can re-establish itself firmly over the people and society and the revolutionary struggle can be ultimately led to its logical culmination.

It is well known that Marx and Engels had to fight against Lassale, Proudhon, Bernstein, Bakunin and others. Lenin had to launch a severe struggle against the Nirodniks, the Plekhanovites,

Kautsky and his followers and other leaders of the Second International.

And like his great fore-runners, Stalin too, had to continue an arduous, life-long struggle against the social democrats of different shades and colours to defend the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism from revisionist deviations and bourgeois liberal distortions.

Any student of the history of the World Communist Movement knows it very well that among the adversaries of Stalin were individuals with statures of Trotsky, Bukharin, Kamenev, Zinoviev and others, who were very prominent and big personalities playing in part of their lives very important roles in the communist movement. So, it is quite understandable that when these personalities having much influence on party organisation and communist movement deviated from Marxism-Leninism, what a difficult and arduous task Stalin was confronted with in protecting from their attack the revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism within the party and the nascent socialist state then existing in a capitalist encirclement. The enormity of the task becomes all the more evident when one takes note of the fact that to defeat Stalin and usurp the leadership of the party and the state Trotsky did not even hesitate to take help from the foreign

capitalist-imperialist powers and enter into conspiracy with them.

And it was after a long and protracted struggle under the leadership of Stalin that the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism once again triumphed over these sham Marxists—these pseudo-revolutionaries.

Time and again Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, one of the outstanding Marxist-Leninist thinkers of the era, reiterated like all other great revolutionaries the truth of the historic lesson that big names of leaders, big organisational strength, huge mass following, all these things in the ultimate analysis, on the question of revolution do not matter at all if the line is wrong. And it is he who pursues the correct revolutionary line, even if he is initially organisationally weak, gains strength and ultimately wins the struggle, establishing his revolutionary leadership over people and country.

Any one conversant with the history of Russian revolution knows that the struggle that Stalin led against these forces was momentous and gigantic in nature. It was a long-drawn struggle that continued throughout his entire revolutionary life.

We like to say that it will be really foolish to claim to cover in one article this historic struggle led by Stalin on which a

number of volumes have appeared already.

In our present article, we will therefore try to highlight, though in a brief outline only some important ideological aspects of this historic struggle of this great leader of the world proletariat.

Stalin's gigantic struggle recalled

The present generation of the workers in the communist movement, we presume, may not be well conversant with the historic background, the concrete questions on which deviations occurred as also Stalin's gigantic fight against these. So, at the very outset, it would be our endeavour to give a brief narration of the same for their benefit.

At first we like to add a few words regarding the term 'social democracy.' This is all the more necessary in view of the fact that prior to the split that took place between the Bolsheviks and the pseudo-revolutionary elements (known as the social democrats) during the Second International, the term social democrat was used in a very broad sense. The communists or Bolsheviks who formed a distinctly different political group within the old Russian Social Democratic Labour Party (RSDLP), the then common platform of struggle of different forces against Tsardom, were also known as social democrats. But

during, and more so, after the Second International, the Bolsheviks organisationally separated themselves from the bourgeois liberals, bourgeois and petty bourgeois elements as these latter forces who dominated the Second International gradually betrayed their anti-Marxist, pro-bourgeois opportunistic class character.

Since then, in the communist movement, these people, who generally outwardly cling to Marxist phraseology but in practice, try to re-interpret or revise the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism so as to meet their sole purpose of creating confusion within the revolutionary struggle and thus work as the agents of the bourgeoisie, as the compromising force between the labour and capital, are commonly termed the social democrats.

In the earlier periods of the Russian revolution many of them belonged to the Menshevik group within the RSDLP. There were also the Plekhanovites, the Trotskyites, the Bukharinites, the Kamenevites, the Zinovievites in the communist movement who go down in history as downright social democrats. Apart from them, there were the parties of the Second International, the social democratic parties of the West-European type which too belonged to the then major trends of social democracy.

It is a fact that an analysis

of their trends of thinking in detail may reveal certain differences between them. Thus, at times, some of them manifested a 'leftist' or 'ultra-leftist' orientation, whereas some others manifested a 'rightist' orientation. In spite of all these differences, it must not be missed that from the point of their class position, and their role of perpetrating an anti-revolutionary trend of thinking within the communist movement they were basically identical. Even a little reflection on their trends of thinking and their moves and activities will no doubt clearly reveal this fact.

Trotsky's opposition to development of socialism in one country

One of the major features of Trotskyism—a major social democratic trend of that period, as exposed thoroughly first by Lenin, and then, following his footsteps, by Stalin, was the theory of permanent revolution. One aspect of this theory of permanent (uninterrupted) revolution was—all students of history know—the lack of faith in the potentiality of the middle and poor peasantry to be an ally of revolution. To the Trotskyites posing a 'left' orientation, the peasantry as a whole appeared to be a 'hostile' class. It had of course another aspect and that was to challenge Lenin's theory of

the possibility of victory of socialism in a single country by claiming, along with the other trends of Mensheviks, that the victory of socialism in a single country (and in a backward country like the then Russia) was impossible without the preliminary victory of socialist revolution "in the principal countries of Western Europe".

It would thus appear that Trotskyism opposed Leninism from a 'left' position and so, in the history of Russian revolution, it correctly earned the name of left social democratic deviation. Bukharin and his followers, who, up to a certain stage of struggle along with Kamenev and Zinoviev, followed the general line of the CPSU and fought against Trotskyism following their deviation from Marxism-Leninism, came openly in defence of the interest of the kulak. Bukharin-Rykov group tried to spread their theory of the kulaks growing into socialism and so was correctly termed by Stalin as to be a right social democratic deviation. It may not be out of place to mention that whereas Trotskyism was opposed to the policy of any kind of durable alliance with the mass of the middle and poor peasant, Bukharin was in favour of any kind of alliance with the peasantry as a whole.

The right and left deviations of these different social

democratic trends were also evident from their attitudes towards the NEP (New Economic Policy).

Bukharin's right deviation

The Soviet State, just after its emergence through revolution, had been compelled to appropriate all surplus produce from the peasants for the needs of defence. This policy, known as War Communism, was necessitated by the war and foreign interventions. Later, when the war ended and the situation became relatively normal and peaceful, the surplus appropriation system was replaced by a tax in kind to adopt the NEP. This allowed some freedom of private trade to the peasants and gave scope to the private manufactures to open small business.

It was rightly considered by Lenin that a certain freedom of trade would encourage the peasant, induce him to produce more and lead to rapid growth of agriculture, and that, on this basis, state-owned industries would be restored; that strength and resources having been thus accumulated powerful industries could ultimately be created.

Any man with the knowledge of ABC of Marxism-Leninism can realise that in a backward country like the then Russia, this was an essential preparatory task for building up the economic foundation of socialism. But, both the

Trotskyites and Bukharinites opposed this policy, though from different positions. While Trotskyites and the like minded left social democrats raised a hue and cry that it was a 'retreat' and that capitalism was being restored in Russia, the right deviators headed by Bukharin, on the other hand, demanded a greater freedom of trade—rather wanted to abolish the role of state as regulator of the market, so as to emancipate it and open up an era of complete free trade.

Among the other infamous social democrats of that period, both Kamenev and Zinoviev, although they had once fought against Trotskyism accepting the general revolutionary line of the CPSU, gradually came closer to Trotsky, as they deviated more and more from the party line, in their bid to fight against Leninism, revolution, party leadership and Stalin. On the question of the role of peasantry, the possibility of the victory of socialism in a single country etc. etc. they, in reality, supported in the main the Trotskyite line, though at times also tried to express their views employing a somewhat different vocabulary.

At times, they had even stepped ahead of Trotsky in supporting his line. Thus, on the question of the possibility of victory of socialism in a single country, while Trotsky levelled against Stalin

the charge of revising Marxism, Kamenev hurled accusation against the whole party declaring that the party "replaces the revolutionary perspective by a national perspective".

But whatever might be their differences, the Trotskyite-Zinovievite clique and Kamenev found no problem to associate themselves with the Bukharin-Rykov clique to conspire against the party and revolution. It is also a fact of history that the foreign capitalist-imperialist powers and fascism found in them faithful servants who were ready to spy, sabotage, commit acts of terrorism and diversion thereby work for the defeat of revolution and the restoration of capitalism in the USSR.

It is therefore easy to see that the rightist Bukharin-Rykov group differed from the bloc of Trotskyites Zinovievites and Kamenevites only in the form, in the fact that the latter had some opportunity to mask their true nature with left revolutionary vociferations about "permanent revolution" whereas the former could not possibly mask their capitulatory character and had to defend the reactionary forces, the kulaks in particular, openly without donning any mask.

It was for this reason that like all other great revolutionaries, Stalin the great leader and teacher of

the proletariat also observed: Lefts are also Rights, only they mask their rightness behind left phrases.

Apart from these various shades of Russian social democrats, internationally a major trend of social democracy was reflected by the then West European Social Democratic parties. These were the parties playing dominant role in the Second International or the parties carrying their traditions wedded to opportunism and bourgeois parliamentarism—the parties openly denouncing revolutionary struggle, renouncing the dictatorship of the proletariat and following the footsteps of their philosopher and guide Karl Kautsky preaching the theory of the peaceful growing of capitalism into socialism.

So far we have discussed in the concrete background the roles and moves of the different major groups of social democrats which Stalin had to fight against during his life-time to protect the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist line within the party and the nascent socialist state.

Both 'left' and right deviations have their common root in social democratism

Now, we like to highlight some important aspects of Stalin's ideological exposure of these forces, their real

class character and their anti-revolutionary trend of thinking which they tried to pass for the Marxist-Leninist theory of revolution.

All conversant with the history of Russian revolution know the fact that even during Lenin's life-time Trotsky who originally belonged to the Menshevik group within the RSDLP, time and again tried to influence the party with his anti-revolutionary trend of thinking, but it was the great revolutionary personality of Lenin, his profound and deep wisdom and revolutionary leadership which frustrated all these attempts. After the demise of great Lenin, Trotsky renewed his attack on the party, tried to usurp its leadership and lead it and the country along the social democratic anti-Marxist-Leninist path. At such a critical moment, Comrade Stalin, as the worthy disciple of Lenin, took command of the party, led an arduous struggle against Trotskyism, exposed its anti-revolutionary social democratic character and ultimately gave it a defeat.

In fact, Trotskyites got such a crushing defeat, both ideologically and organisationally at the hands of Stalin that Trotskyism met a virtual death internationally. Trotskyism as a trend of thinking has become so much disreputed before the world people that very few

of the Trotskyites do proclaim themselves to be such.

Apart from their non-recognition of historical fact of the victory of socialism in parts of the globe, which in reality reveals their adherence to the thoroughly discredited claim of the old Trotskyites that the victory of socialism would not be possible in a single country, their adherence to Trotskyism is generally manifested in their baseless unethical criticism which they most often direct against Stalin to malign him.

Following the teachings of Marx, Engels and more particularly those of Lenin, Stalin thoroughly exposed the hollowness of this claim and revealed the utter falsity of these self-styled, so-called theoreticians who blindly and dogmatically tried to follow the letters of books on Marxism and therefore utterly failed to grasp the essence of this creative science.

While strongly criticising these people, these so-called Marxists who clung to Engel's old formulation of the impossibility of proletarian revolution in one country so as to use it as a screen and facilitate their fight against revolution, Stalin observed: what Engels in the forties of the last century in the conditions of pre-monopoly capitalism considered impracticable and impossible for one country, became practicable and possible in our country (i.e. Russia) in

the conditions of imperialism. He added: it cannot be expected of Engels or Marx, however great their genius as thinkers, that they should have foreseen in the period of pre-monopoly capitalism all the potentialities of the class struggle of the proletariat and the proletarian revolution that were revealed more than half a century later, in the period of developed monopoly capitalism; secondly, there is nothing surprising in the fact that Lenin, as a brilliant disciple of Engels and Marx, was able to note the new potentialities of the proletarian revolution in the new conditions of capitalist development, and thus discovered the truth that the victory of socialism in one country is possible. One must know how to distinguish between the letter and the essence of Marxism, between its various propositions and its method. Lenin succeeded in discovering the truth that the victory of socialism is possible in one country because he did not regard Marxism as a dogma, but as a guide to action, because he was not a slave of the letter, and was able to grasp what was primary and basic in Marxism.

Stalin further added: That is the path, the path of Marx, Engels and Lenin, which we are following and which we must continue to follow if we want to remain revolutionaries to the end.

It is because Leninism has kept to this path, and continues to do so, that it has held its own as the Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. To depart from this path means to land in the quagmire of opportunism. To deviate from this path means to drag at the tail of social democracy. (On the opposition page 447-50)

While referring to the possibility of victory of socialism in a single country, in the changed context of monopoly capitalism Stalin had in his mind also the law of uneven development of capitalism propounded by Lenin.

Lenin said: Uneven economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism. Hence, the victory of socialism is possible first in several, or even in one capitalist country taken separately".

(Collected Works, Vol. 28, page 232-33)

It was while exposing the opportunism of social democracy in general and that of Trotskyism in particular, Stalin aptly remarked: Opportunism does not always mean a direct denial of the Marxist theory or of any of its propositions and conclusions. Opportunism is sometimes expressed in the attempt to cling to certain of the propositions of Marxism that have already become antiquated and to convert them into a dogma

so as to retard the further development of Marxism, and consequently to retard the development of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat."

(History of the CPSU, page 544)

It was to identify and distinguish these brands of social democrats from the genuine Marxists that Stalin stated: There are two groups of Marxists. Both work under the flag of Marxism and consider themselves 'genuinely' Marxist. Nevertheless, they are by no means identical. More, a veritable gulf divides them, for their methods of work are diametrically opposed to each other.

The first group (i.e. the social democrats—Ed. P. Era) usually confines itself to an outward acceptance, to a ceremonial avowal of Marxism. Being unable or unwilling to grasp the essence of Marxism, being unable or unwilling to put it into practice, it converts the living, revolutionary principles of Marxism into lifeless, meaningless formulas. It does not base its activities on experience, on what practical work teaches but on quotations from Marx. It does not derive its instructions and directions from an analysis of living reality, but from analogies and historical parallels. (J. V. Stalin Works Vol. 4 page 317).

One of the reasons that led Stalin to make such a

remark was clear from Stalin's own words when he observed: They do not understand that the chief task of leadership... is to discover, to grasp the nationally peculiar features of the movement in each country and skilfully coordinate them with the Comintern's general principles, in order to facilitate and make feasible the basic aims of the Communist movement.

Hence the attempts to stereotype the leadership for all countries. Hence the attempts mechanically to implant certain general formulas, regardless of concrete conditions of the movement in different countries. Hence the endless conflicts between the formulas and the revolutionary movement in different countries, as the main outcome of the leadership of these pseudo leaders". (On the opposition page 736)

Social-democracy's ceremonial avowal of Marxism

The real character of the social democrats was thoroughly exposed by Stalin who, while characterising the social democratic force, labelled them: a party of petty bourgeois intellectuals who are ever vacillating between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between revolution and counter-revolution. Hence the inevitable contradictions between the

word and the deed, the perpetual uncertainty and mental waverings. (Works Vol 4, page 143). Stalin further said that these people derived their strength not from the revolutionary movement of the masses but from compromise arrangements of bourgeois politicians. And this policy of compromise, Stalin emphasised: must lead to betrayal of the interests of revolution. (Works Vol 3, page 330-331).

In fact, these people try to camouflage their opportunistic character with 'left' phrases, making a parade of revolutionary slogans and under its cover serve the enemies of revolution. They are proved to be political swindlers, political double-dealers.

Social-democrats are political double-dealers

Political double-dealers, Stalin observed: usually begin with deceit and prosecute their nefarious ends by deceiving the people, the working class and the party of the working class. But political double-dealers are not to be regarded as mere humbugs. Political double-dealers are an unprincipled gang of political careerists who, having long ago lost the confidence of the people, strive to insinuate themselves once more into their confidence by deception, by chameleon-like changes of colour, by fraud, by any means, only that they might retain the

title of political figures. Political double-dealers are an unprincipled gang of political careerists who are ready to seek support anywhere, even among criminal elements, even among the scum of society, even among the mortal enemies of the people, only that they might be able, at a "propitious" moment, again to mount the political stage and to clamber on to the backs of the people as their "rulers". (History of the CPSU, page 445-'47)

To what extent these political double-dealers, these social democrats may serve the interest of the bourgeoisie thereby conspire against the people, will be evident from Stalin's following observation which he made during the first world war.

Stalin stated: "From the very outbreak of the war, the petty-bourgeois parties—the Socialist Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks—using the flag of socialism as a screen helped the bourgeoisie to deceive the people by concealing the imperialist predatory character of the war." (History of the CPSU, page 252).

A similar anti-people move was taken by the parties of the Second International, which turned, out-and-out social-democratic in character. So, while exposing their anti-people role and move, Stalin observed: "The opportunists of the Second International helped

the bourgeoisie to deceive the people. The social democrats of the Second International vilely betrayed the cause of socialism, the cause of the international solidarity of the proletariat. Far from opposing the war, they assisted the bourgeoisie in inciting the workers and peasants of the belligerent countries against each other on the plea of defending the father land".

Moreover, these opportunists of the Second International asserted, guided by their mentor Kautsky, that a forcible seizure of power by the proletariat was not necessarily the method of advance towards socialism, that the dictatorship of the proletariat must not necessarily be understood as meaning the smashing of the old bourgeois state apparatus and the building of a new, proletarian one and that therefore what the proletariat had to strive for was a peaceful path of transition from capitalism to socialism. The mortal sin of the Second International, Stalin commented, "was not that it pursued the tactics of utilising the parliamentary forms of struggle, but that it over-estimated the importance of these forms, that it considered them virtually the only forms and that when the period of open revolutionary battles set in and the question of extra-parliamentary forms of struggle came to the fore,

the parties of the Second International turned their backs on these new tasks and refused to shoulder them". (Problems of Leninism, page 68)

While elaborating the teachings of Marx, and in particular of Lenin, regarding the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism, Stalin observed that Marx conceded that possibility in regard to England and America when monopoly capitalism or imperialism had not made its appearance and when these countries had as yet not developed militarism and bureaucracy. But later, with the development of monopoly capitalism and imperialism and with the bourgeoisie becoming wedded to militarism and bureaucracy, the conditions for peaceful development had disappeared and the law of violent proletarian revolution, the law of smashing the bourgeois state machine as a preliminary condition for such a revolution to succeed in the capitalist imperialist countries became valid. Of course in the remote future if the revolution is victorious in most of the capitalist countries and if the present capitalist encirclement is replaced by a socialist encirclement, a peaceful path of development may be possible in certain capitalist countries, where the ruling class, in view of the unfavourable international situation may consider it expedient to

concede power to the proletariat. But this supposition applies only to the remote future and so long capitalism-imperialism exists as a world system there is no ground for such a supposition.

**Renunciation of
revolutionary essence
of Marxism by the
social democrats**

While criticising the utter social-democratic character manifested by these parties in their idea of rejecting the necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat, Stalin, after elaborating the historic teachings of Lenin, emphatically observed that a revolutionary transformation from capitalism to socialism could never be achieved without "the dictatorship of the proletariat" which, to quote Lenin, "is not an end of the class struggle but its continuation in new forms. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the class struggle of the proletariat, which has won victory and has seized political power, against the bourgeoisie, which although vanquished has not been annihilated, has not disappeared, has not ceased its resistance, has increased its resistance."

Stalin added: "The dictatorship of the proletariat cannot arise as the result of the peaceful development of bourgeois society and of bourgeois democracy, it can arise only as the result of

the smashing of the bourgeois state machine, the bourgeois army, the bourgeois bureaucratic machine, the bourgeois police."

While exposing the bourgeois reformist character of these social-democratic parties, who cling to bourgeois parliamentarism, Stalin referred to Lenin's historic observation that with the appearance of Soviet power, "the era of bourgeois democratic parliamentarism has come to an end and a new chapter in world history—the era of proletarian dictatorship—has commenced". He then emphatically added: "The October Revolution exposed the lie of the Social Democrats that it is possible at present to effect a peaceful transition to socialism through bourgeois parliamentarism."

(Problems of Leninism,
page 199)

Parliamentary solution is not possible, because even the ruling classes in the capitalist countries are destroying the last vestiges of parliamentarism, because the victory of fascism was a sign that even "the bourgeoisie is no longer able to rule by the old methods of parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy".

(Vol. 13, page 299-300)

Stalin asked: Does not the history of the revolutionary movement show that the parliamentary struggle is only a school for and an aid in organizing the extra-

parliamentary struggle of the proletariat, that under capitalism the fundamental problems of the working class movement are solved by force, by the direct struggle of the proletarian masses, their general strike, their insurrection?

It was after witnessing the out-and-out social democratic character of these parties and their naked practice of bourgeois parliamentarism, Stalin commented: "The parties of the Second International are unfit for the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat.... they are not militant parties of the proletariat, leading workers to power, but election machines adapted for parliamentary elections and parliamentary struggle".

(History of the CPSU,
page 538)

And while exposing the role of these West European social democratic parties in bringing about fascism, counter-revolutionary upsurge of the bourgeoisie, Stalin observed: "Fascism is not a military-technical category. Fascism is the bourgeois fighting organisation that relies on the active support of Social Democracy. Social Democracy is objectively the moderate wing of fascism". (vol. 10, page 294)

So far, we have tried, while discussing Stalin's ideological struggle against social democratism, to reveal the truth that, since its birth, social democratism has been

working as the main danger before revolution. Whenever the established bourgeois parties fail to serve the bourgeoisie these parties come to the rescue of the bourgeoisie. These forces are more dangerous than the established bourgeois parties. Because, the people do not need much time to identify the true character of the established bourgeois parties but an arduous ideological-political struggle is required to be developed by the revolutionaries to expose and isolate these forces, which, remaining within people's struggle always try to shield the main enemy from the attack by the people. So one cannot attack the main enemy, capitalism without exposing and defeating these forces.

Social-democratism an ideological support of capitalism

This brings us to Stalin's historic remark: "Present-day social-democratism is an ideological support of capitalism, Lenin was a thousand times right when he said that the present day social democratic politicians are real agents of the bourgeoisie in the working class movement, the labour lieutenants of the capitalist class, that in the civil war between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie they would inevitably range themselves on the side of the 'Versaillese' against the 'Communards'."

It is impossible to put an end to capitalism without putting an end to social-democratism in the labour movement. That is why the era of dying capitalism is also the era of dying social-democratism in the labour movement." (Vol 13, page 253).

But a pertinent question is how can one put an end to social democratism, the main danger before revolution. In this regard the great November Revolution has taught us an important lesson, which Stalin thoroughly elaborated in his famous article, 'The October Revolution and Tactics.' Elaborating the fundamental strategic rule of Leninism, Stalin observed that it is the recognition of the following:

Direction of the mainblow in the period of Socialist Revolution

1) The compromising parties are the most dangerous social support of the enemies of the revolution in the period of the approaching revolutionary outbreak.;

2) it is impossible to overthrow the enemy (Tsarism or the bourgeoisie) unless these parties are isolated;

3) the main weapons in the period of preparation for the revolution must therefore be directed towards isolating these parties, towards winning the broad masses of the working people away from them." (On the

Opposition, page 164-65). Stalin then with unique analysis had shown that to give a crushing defeat to the main enemy of revolution, one had to launch intense ideological struggle and thereby to direct the main blow against the compromising social democratic parties which keeping themselves in the current of the movement give protection to the main enemy against the attack from the revolutionary force. And that was why, during pre-February Revolution period in Russia when the Bolsheviks were in an united platform with the Cadet to launch a united struggle against the Tsardom, they directed the main blow against the Cadets and pursued an intense ideological struggle against them. Likewise after February Revolution when they were fighting against the bourgeoisie from a united platform with social-revolutionaries, they constantly maintained the direction of the main blow against them.

So long we have tried to highlight some aspects of the ideological struggle that comrade Stalin had to launch to give defeat to the then different trends of social democracy, with the sole object of protecting revolution and the nascent socialist state from their attack.

It was a fact that these compromising forces met an ignominious defeat at the hands of Stalin; but one must note that these trends could

not be eradicated altogether. And the Marxists-Leninists know that so long capitalism exists as a world system, social democratism cannot meet complete defeat; because just as capitalism which fosters social democratism gives birth to revisionism so also revisionism in its turn protects capitalism.

After the 20th Congress of the CPSU when the revisionists usurped the leadership of the Soviet party and the state, social democratism and revisionism raised their ugly heads in various shades and colours and posed great danger to the prospect of revolution in different countries. So, historically, the bounden duty of exposing and defeating this danger was once again entrusted upon the revolutionaries.

**Comrade Shibdas Ghosh's
gigantic struggle in
defence of the
revolutionary banner of
Marxism after Stalin**

Today, on the occasion of birth centenary of Comrade Stalin, one must recall that just as Stalin, following the footsteps of his forerunners Marx, Engels and Lenin, exposed and defeated the different trends of the then social democracy so also Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, following the great revolutionary teachings and heritage of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse-Tung and integrating the general principles of

Marxism-Leninism with concrete practice, while elaborating, developing and enriching the science of Marxism-Leninism to a new height in many aspects in the post Lenin period, gave a thorough exposure to the various modern national and international trends of social democracy by probing deep into their roots and pointing out the scientific path to fight against and give defeat to these forces. It is really difficult to comprehend now what a gigantic struggle Comrade Ghosh had to launch to fulfil this task, particularly in view of the fact that to achieve this essential task of revolution of the present era, Comrade Ghosh had to lead an untiring ideological struggle against the world forces of revisionism headed by the revisionist leadership of CPSU on the one hand and the so-called big communist parties of our soil enjoying international recognition on the other.

We must realise that just as the great teachers of revolution, Marx and Engels for historical reasons were not in a position to visualize the new potentialities of the proletarian revolution in the future conditions of the development of monopoly capitalism which Lenin afterwards was able to take note of, so also it could not be expected of the great forerunners of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh that they

should have foreseen during their time what Comrade Ghosh as their worthy disciple could throw light on in the new situation of proletarian struggle. Comrade Ghosh had to take up this most arduous task of defending the revolutionary essence of Marxism when modern social democracy and revisionism appeared as the main danger in the international communist movement, when serious shortcomings and defects were creating confusion and split in the international communist movement and more so when fascism manifested itself in diverse forms in all capitalist-imperialist countries, be it advanced or relatively less developed.

And it is the path—the path that Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao Tse-Tung and Shibdas Ghosh followed—that we as revolutionaries must follow to the end of our life.

With his brilliant analysis Comrade Shibdas Ghosh laid bare the fact that modern revisionism was nothing but an outcome of the trend of social democracy which after having been discredited substantially and isolated as an organised political force is still continuing as a powerful political trend within the world communist movement.

In his famous booklet "Self-criticism of the Communist Camp" (original articles were published in Bengali

in 1948, later their English versions were published in the November Revolution special issue of Proletarian Era in 1976) Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, with a penetrating analysis, for the first time in the history of world communist movement showed that it was primarily due to the attack of modern revisionism headed by Soviet revisionist leadership which appeared as the main danger before the world revolution that the world communist camp had suffered division and disunity, even after it had once reached the very threshold of victory. Comrade Ghosh also showed that the dialectical process of thinking and method of organisation through struggle and interaction of ideas was generally given good bye and instead most of the communist parties chose the easy way of mechanical centralisation. This led to the unbelievable lowering of ideological standard through the practice of lending continuous blind support to the international leadership.

He further observed that it would not be astonishing if this practise of dittoing or lending blind support to the international leadership might at times as an opposite reaction, gave birth to an ultra-independent, an extreme trend of opposing the international leadership and even the basic tenets of Marxism-Leninism. The slogan of polycentricism,

Eurocommunism, renunciation of the dictatorship of proletariat, the quintessence of the theory of Marxism-Leninism, and last but not least the recent change of Soviet Constitution claiming the Soviet State "the state of the whole people" which is in fact the other version of the Lassaleian revisionist doctrine of 'free state',—all these will bear clear testimony to his observations.

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh's historic contributions in the fight against modern revisionism

Exposing the ideological-cultural roots of these deviations, Comrade Ghosh drew attention to the vital shortcoming of the communist movement, its drawback to build up proper struggle centring round issues like morals, ethics and culture.

In this connection we like to recall what Comrade Ghosh had left to us in his lessons, in the field of human values, morals, ethics and culture, which will always be remembered as invaluable addition to the treasure house of Marxism-Leninism. While analysing the character of communist morals Comrade Ghosh observed: Communist moral is fundamentally different from humanist moral value both in content and character. In the annals of human society humanism is not the last word though it is the most lively air that the

oppressive bourgeois society is capable of giving birth to in the march of progress of society. It further reveals that the communist values are superior to and higher than humanist values. It is only on the ashes of humanist values can communist moral values grow and prosper.

So, Comrade Ghosh observed, "communism begins where humanism ends."

(Vide 'On steps taken against Stalin.' Comrade Shibdas Ghosh.)

Comrade Ghosh added that it was due to the lack of proper struggle to build up communist values of life that the seed of nationalist reformist feeling that bourgeois humanist values breed, could not be eradicated from the communist movement. This gave birth to national chauvinism and ultra-nationalist feeling within the communist movement. This sense of ultra-nationalist feelings which remained subdued during Stalin's lifetime owing to a fierce ideological struggle but which was not eradicated altogether raised its ugly head when the Soviet revisionist leadership in the name of fighting the cult of individual, undertook the programme of De-Stalinisation which seriously undermined his authority. It influenced the communist movement and gained in strength from the nationalist-reformist interpretation of Leninist theory of different forms of achievement of

socialism by the Khrushchevite leadership. The pernicious effect that this ultra-nationalist reformist trend was creating within the movement, Comrade Ghosh added, was once reflected in the Tito incident, the incident of Hungary, in the slogan for separate Balkan Federation etc, etc. This trend which was being manifested in the growth of nationalist reformist orientation within the parties claiming to be communist, in the concrete forms of ultra independence, hegemonism and various serious types of reformist-revisionist distortions of Marxism-Leninism as also, gross deviations from the fundamental tenets of this revolutionary theory were witnessed to permeate through and through the communist movement, particularly after the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

Again it was Comrade Shibdas Ghosh who, while giving exposure to the various trends of modern social democratism, drew our attention to one particular aspect of Trotskyism—that very aspect of this anti-revolutionary trend of thinking which exists at present in fusion with other brands of social democracy and acts as a danger to revolution.

In this connection Comrade Shibdas Ghosh repeatedly pointed out that after its virtual death as a force to reckon with in the

political movement, Trotskyism is also working as another trend or bent of mind in the communist movement. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh added that the theory of formation of national democratic governments along with the national bourgeoisie of different capitalist countries as a means to “peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism” is nothing but a peculiar fusion of these two trends of social democracy and Trotskyism in the communist movement. So, as the theory of the Soviet revisionist leadership to transform parliament into an instrument of people’s will is a downright expression of the trend of unadulterated social democracy, so also the theory of implanting or exporting revolution (emanated from the Trotskyite theory of permanent revolution) by destroying the old parliamentary democratic setup by combining with the military, bureaucracy and the national bourgeoisie in different countries—the theory which the Soviet revisionist leadership uphold, as testified by their moves—is a manifestation of the conspiratorial bent of mind of Trotskyism.

Some Trotskyites try to claim that the emergence of the worst type of revisionism and the symptoms of the danger of restoration of capitalism in Soviet Russia indicates that the victory of

socialism is impossible in a single country.

These people fail to follow the lesson that if the seeds of revisionism-reformism, which Comrade Shibdas Ghosh had brilliantly exposed in his teachings, are not completely removed then the danger of revisionism thriving and giving birth to the symptoms of restoration of capitalism after the victory of socialism, is bound to remain not only in a single country but even in a number of countries as well.

Moreover, it may be relevant to mention that Stalin too, observed time and again that ‘loss of socialist perspective’ ‘decline of party leadership’ ‘survivals of capitalism in the minds of the people’—all these things, so long capitalist encirclement exists, pose the danger of restoration of capitalism in a socialist state—the danger of which, if not eradicated in time, may ultimately lead to the degeneration of socialist state to a capitalist state or rather, according to the modern terminology to a, social fascist state.

Again, while exposing the hollowness of the Khrushchevite revisionist formula of peaceful realisation of socialism by transforming parliament into the instrument of people’s will—the formula that we have mentioned earlier and that carries the heritage of even social democratism of the

parties of the Second International and is being upheld by the major trends of modern social democracy, both national and international, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh in his famous article 'War, Peace, Peaceful Co-existence and Peaceful Transition to Socialism', further developed the teachings of Stalin and categorically observed that: even if it is assumed that peaceful realization of socialist revolution is possible in remote future it will not be possible by following the so-called theory of transformation of parliament from an organ of bourgeois democracy into a genuine instrument of people's will, which is a non-Marxist utter revisionist idea aimed at justifying the naked practice of bourgeois parliamentarism.

Peaceful realization of socialism, Comrade Ghosh added, if it is at all possible, means peaceful capture of power, the bourgeoisie offering no resistance and peaceful destruction of the bourgeois state machine and establishment in its place a new type of state, the proletarian state. It does not mean peaceful transformation of the bourgeois state through reforms which cannot be done. It also means the peaceful dissolution of parliament and replacing it by the workers' democratic institution and not peaceful transformation of parliament into an instrument of people's will, which

also cannot be done. Because, parliament which once evolved in a definite historical condition as the political superstructure of the capitalist economic base to serve the interest of the capitalist class not only cannot serve as the superstructure of socialist economy but also does obstruct the growth of that society. Explaining further the utter futility of the parliament to work as a viable instrument of the proletariat Comrade Ghosh added: even in countries with long parliamentary tradition parliamentary democratic rights are being curtailed, parliament is fast losing its utility even to the bourgeoisie and fascism is manifesting itself in diverse forms in all capitalist-imperialist countries—be it advanced or relatively less developed.

And this brings us to one of Comrade Ghosh's historic contribution to the treasure house of Marxism-Leninism.

Once there was much confusion within the communist movement regarding the character of fascism, the arch enemy of humanity. In the earlier part of our present article, we referred to what Stalin had observed regarding the relation between social democracy and fascism. Basing himself on the teachings of his fore runners, Comrade Ghosh gave a thorough exposure to this counter

revolutionary organisation of the bourgeoisie covering its cultural, philosophical, socio-political and economic aspects and highlighted the inter-relation that exists between modern social democracy and fascism.

While exposing the character of this historically conditioned form of counter-revolution, Comrade Ghosh observed that depending upon different objective conditions fascism may take diverse forms. It may manifest itself in the form of naked dictatorship, or may take a deceptive look by keeping alive parliament and the facade of democracy. Always and everywhere it adopts a dual policy of suppression and persuasion. It adopts social democratic plans, grants minor economic concessions, and creates confusion in mass mind by social democratic postures and utterances. Being a peculiar fusion of spiritualism and science, it takes the help of the latter for economic growth and military might but inculcates mysticism, blind faith, obscurantism in the cultural social fields. It propagates class harmony, promotes national jingoism, fanaticism, and fosters social and communal hatred and all other backward sentiments amongst the masses.

To characterise that particular trend of social democracy which is instrumental in bringing about fascism,

Comrade Ghosh observed: It should be borne in mind that among the social democratic parties affiliated to the Second International, those who were more liberal in their approach could not bring about fascism because of looseness in their organisational structure, rather it was those social democratic parties who subsequently turned revisionist and national chauvinist and who were of more militant character and who fostered fanaticism, blindness, obstinacy among their ranks that gave birth to fascism.

**Modern revisionism
fluttering red banner
poses the danger—
of fascism—
Comrade Ghosh's
historic warning**

Comrade Ghosh further added: In our time those communist parties who have already degenerated into revisionist parties and reduced themselves to the position of national communist parties, in other words, who are communists in name only, but social democratic parties in practice, do have every possibility of turning themselves into fascist parties, if these parties, while waving the red banner and moving under the cover of Marxism, combine blindness and fanaticism with their so-called militant character. ('Why SUCI is the Only

Genuine Communist Party in India')

While explaining their so called militancy Comrade Ghosh of course made it clear that militancy born out of revolutionary ideology is not one and the same with the so-called militancy bred by fanaticism, blindness and superstition.

We may recall here his historic warning that: 'Once Fascism came out of the womb of social democracy, now social democracy is the last prop of Fascism'.

Comrade Ghosh's exposition of the modern social democracy for obvious reasons was not limited only in the international sphere. While developing the theory of Indian revolution by integrating concrete practice on our soil with the general principles of Marxism-Leninism, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh gave a thorough exposure to the different trends of social democracy, more so those brands which includes our CPI and CPI(M) who outwardly cling to Marxist phraseology but under its very cover practise rotten social democratism and revisionism Comrade Ghosh had to fulfil this historical task because we know that victory of revolution can never be achieved without identifying, exposing, isolating and defeating these social democratic forces which pose the main danger before revolution.

**CPI and CPI(M) follow
the Khrushchevite revisionist
formula of peaceful
transition to socialism
and practise
parliamentary reformism**

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh time and again gave exposure to the fact that just like their international counterparts, they too, failing to integrate the concrete practice in the concrete conditions of our country with the general international line of revolution thereby failing to evolve the particular theory of Indian Revolution, its strategy and tactics, copied either the international general line of revolution or the particular theory of revolution of this or that leading communist party of the international communist movement and tried to pass it for the theory of Indian Revolution. The Khrushchevite formula of the National Democratic Revolution, to which the CPI has attached itself or the theory of People's Democratic Revolution of the CPI(M) and CPI(M-L)—all clearly manifest their 'skill' in mechanically copying this or that leading party of the communist movement.

These parties failing to integrate practice with the theory of Marxism-Leninism which too they could not grasp correctly—have failed to develop as the vanguard of the proletariat and thereby following the immutable law of history developed into the

parties destined to serve the bourgeoisie, the establishment.

Their arch revisionist social democratic character is betrayed through their naked practice of bourgeois parliamentarism and in this regard they are the heirs to the arch social democratic parties of the Second International.

To deceive the people by preserving the left cloak that they don, they invent queer theoretical propositions to defend their naked practice of bourgeois parliamentary politics.

Both the CPI and CPI(M) openly advocate the Khrushchevite revisionist formula of peaceful transition to socialism by transforming parliament into an instrument of people's will and under the cover of such a unique theoretical exercise practise rotten bourgeois national reformism. So, while the CPI writes in its party programme: "The Communist Party of India strives to achieve the establishment of People's Democracy and socialist transformation through peaceful means" the CPI(M) also says in its party programme that it "strives to achieve the establishment of People's Democracy and socialist transformation through peaceful means". Both the parties however try to cover up their revisionism by a deceptive clause that "the ruling classes never relinquish their power

voluntarily."

—(CPI(M)'s "Central Committee's Draft For The Ideological Discussion" August 18-27, 1967)

One may be provoked to ask them: Do they think that they have already arrived at that 'remote future' as defined by Stalin when the capitalist encirclement has been replaced by a socialist one in the existing international situation where capitalism-imperialism exists as a world system? Will the rank and file of the CPI(M) ponder over this question?

Now let us reflect for a while on their so-called theory of Peoples' Democratic revolution. They admit the fact that the national bourgeoisie which had led the freedom movement was established in the state power in the country. Yet they claim our revolution to be PDR in which national bourgeoisie acts as an ally. Comrade Ghosh therefore observed: to admit that it is the national bourgeoisie which is in the state power and to characterise in the next breath the same national bourgeoisie to be an ally of revolution cannot but raise a pertinent question as to whether their 'revolution' meaning People's Democratic Revolution at all implies the overthrow of the present state machine." (Vide Why SUCI is the only genuine communist party of India).

So Comrade Ghosh added: naturally by holding the national bourgeoisie to be an

ally of their revolution, their revolution too like that of the CPI was bound to remain a revolution in verbiage and in reality they would continue to practise and remain totally engrossed in the parliamentary politics despite mouthing revolutionary slogans at the same time, a fact which has been already very much reflected in their day to day behaviour. (Ibid)

It is therefore amply clear that all these social democratic parties and particularly both the CPI and CPI(M) under the screen of leftist vocabulary and the parade of revolutionary slogans aim at only one object and that is to fulfil the bourgeois conspiratorial design of keeping alive the illusion of bourgeois parliamentarism among the people. To serve the bourgeoisie they conspire to keep the people's movement arrested within the ambit of bourgeois parliamentary politics. If any one does not keep his eyes shut but watch closely everything then he cannot but realise that the ruling bourgeoisie, the big business and monopoly houses patronise, these parties which serve them best particularly at the moment when the established bourgeois parties become exposed to the people.

Their eagerness and design to serve the bourgeoisie which is a long standing practice of the social democratic trend become far more clearly revealed when they

go to governmental power with the help of the bourgeoisie. To serve the ruling bourgeoisie, and with this end in view to keep-arrested the sharpening of class struggle between the working class and the bourgeoisie, they not only discourage the growth of peoples struggle, but also take recourse to brutal measures to nip in the bud any possible growth of any such movement. They thus foster class-collaboration and class peace in place of class struggle. In fact this is also an age-old practice of the social democrats. And that was why Stalin also was found to observe: "The social chauvinists, the Russian Mensheviks and social revolutionaries among their members, preached class peace between the workers and the bourgeoisie" (History of the CPSU, page 256). And it was while exposing the role of these type of governments led by the social democrats, and the activities of the ministers of such governments that Stalin observed: ".....these parties always scatter 'left' phrases particularly on the eve of elections, and particularly when they are being hard pressed by a competitor, a genuine socialist party. But 'at the top' the 'Radical Socialists', 'Independent Socialist' government ministers calmly carry on with their bourgeois work totally regardless of the socialist aspirations of their electors." (Vol 3, page 264-65):

Again, in matter of playing tricks to deceive the people, perhaps the CPI(M) has surpassed all records.

It is well known that when the Soviet revisionist leadership with the object of debasing Marxism-Leninism, perpetrated heinous attack on Stalin to malign his authority, the present leaders of the CPI(M) who were then in the united CPI lent uncritical support to all these moves. Moreover even the other day some of them villified Stalin calling him a 'personal dictator.'

But knowing full well that the image of Stalin is alive in the people's mind and also among a section of their cadres, who recall his name in reverence, they, want to exploit these feelings and sentiments and therefore give ceremonial obeisance to Stalin on the occasion of his birth centenary but denounce in reality all the revolutionary teachings, Stalin stood for all through his life. This reminds us what Lenin once observed; Lenin stated. "It has always been the case in history that after the death of revolutionary leaders who were popular among the oppressed classes, their enemies have attempted to appropriate their names so as to deceive the oppressed classes". (Imperialism and the Split in Socialism)

In fact they too in the name of recalling Stalin are in reality like other section of the revisionists maligning

him and degrading his name before the people.

Stalin's Behest

Stalin adjured the Marxists-Leninists to develop this science of all sciences through practice on their soil so as to resolve the problems facing their own revolution, but instead these people continue their blind practice of copying the political line of this or that party in the name of revolution.

Stalin adjured the Marxists Leninists to hold aloft the banner of revolution, but instead these people nakedly practise narrow bourgeois politics.

Stalin adjured the Marxists-Leninists to hold aloft the banner of democracy and democratic rights which the bourgeoisie left to the ground, so as to build up mighty democratic struggle as a precursor to the revolutionary struggle of the people. But these people while mouthing this teaching of Stalin instead of organising people to struggle are engaged in allying with the reactionary bourgeois parties and groups to secure berths in the bourgeois parliamentary politics.

Stalin adjured the Marxists-Leninists to hold aloft the banner of internationalism, but instead these parties practise narrow nationalist reformism and at times manifest ultra-nationalist feelings and ultra-independent trend of thinking.

So those who desire to carry forward the task of revolution, can never succeed in their mission without exposing and giving defeat to all these brands of social democracy which through their moves and activities always pose danger to the revolution.

And to fulfil this task what the people need is a genuine leadership that has mastered Marxism-Leninism.

Mastering of Marxism-Leninism does not mean to quote Stalin "learning all of its formulas and conclusions by heart and clinging to their every letter..."

Mastering of Marxist-Leninist theory means assimilating the substance of this theory and learning to use it in the solution of the practical problems of the revolutionary movement under the varying conditions of the class struggle of the proletariat."

'Mastering of the Marxist-Leninist theory means being able to enrich this theory with the new experiences of the revolutionary movement with new propositions and

conclusions; it means being able to develop it and advance it without hesitating to replace such of its propositions and conclusions as have become antiquated by new ones corresponding to the new historical situation.'

The revolutionary heritage of Stalin

In our country it was Comrade Shibdas Ghosh who carrying the great heritage of the revolutionary thoughts and teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse-Tung and integrating the theory of Marxism-Leninism with practice mastered this science of all sciences, developed and advanced it to such a height so that this may work as the real and adequate instrument in the hands of the present day proletariat to fight against and give defeat to the modern trends of social democracy—the main danger of revolution, while not relaxing for a moment the fight against the capitalist-imperialist class.

It is his thoughts and teachings that illumines the

real scientific path to fight and defeat not only the politics of the parties like the CPI and CPI(M) but also the different modern international trends of social democracy—all those followers of the blackguards of revolution namely, Kautsky, Bernstein, Lassale, Trotsky, Plekhanov, Bukharin, the Macdonalds, the Scheidemanns, the Tseritelis, the Hilferdings, Khrushchev and others.

So this is not our humble submission but firm conviction that today to fulfil the task of fighting against and giving defeat to the modern trends of social democracy, revisionism and reformism, while educating oneself in thoughts and lessons of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse-Tung, one must have to educate himself with the thoughts and teachings of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh.

And if we can fulfil the task devolved on us by history, then and then only we can pay real homage to Comrade J. V. Stalin, the great leader and teacher of the world proletariat.

"To a reformist, reforms are everything while revolutionary work is something incidental, something just to talk about, mere eyewash. That is why, with reformist tactics under the conditions of bourgeois rule, reforms are inevitably transformed into an instrument for disintegrating the revolution. To a revolutionary, on the contrary, the main thing is revolutionary work and not reforms; to him reforms are a by-product of the revolution. That is why, with revolutionary tactics under the conditions of bourgeois rule, reforms are naturally transformed into an instrument for disintegrating that rule, into an instrument for strengthening the revolution, into a strong point for the further development of the revolutionary movement."

—J. V. Stalin

PROLETARIAN ERA

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA

(Fortnightly)

Vol. 13.

NOVEMBER 7, '79

PRICE Rs. 2

No. 5

WEDNESDAY

Air Surcharge 10 p.

Editor-in-Chief : NIHAR MUKHERJEE

Edited & Published by Sukomal Das Gupta from 48, Lenin Sarani and Printed by him
at Ganadabi Printers & Publishers Private Limited 52B, Indian Mirror Street Cal.-13.